



3 1761 06898165 3



Q

1/2

ANALYSIS OF
WATSON'S THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTES.



Presented to the
LIBRARY *of the*
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
by the
**INSTITUTE FOR
CHRISTIAN STUDIES**

Library
INSTITUTE FOR CHRISTIAN STUDIES
TORONTO, CANADA

ANALYSIS

OF THE

REV. RICHARD WATSON'S

THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTES,

DESIGNED FOR THE USE OF

STUDENTS AND EXAMINING COMMITTEES.

Revised and Corrected Edition.

LONDON :
GEORGE LAMB, SUTTON STREET,
COMMERCIAL ROAD, EAST.

—
MDCCCLXXI.



LONDON :

PRINTED BY T. DANKS, CRANE COURT, FLEET STREET.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE "Theological Institutes" of the Rev. Richard Watson furnish, to young ministers and students, the most faithful and comprehensive exposition of the doctrines of Christianity, as held by the several sections of the wide-spread Methodist family. Though the work was originally published, in parts, between the years 1823 and 1829, it has never been superseded by any later system of divinity; but is still adapted, with very few exceptions, to the advanced state of theological literature, and is really indispensable to the student of Methodist Theology.

The "Theological Institutes" partake much of the spirit of Melancthon, and of the power of Episcopius. And, as a System of Theology, vigorously and devoutly reasoned, it is deservedly esteemed by many ministers and students beyond the pale of Methodism. In 1852, the late Dr. John Brown, of Edinburgh, when speaking of Methodist authors, said to us, "Mr. Watson was a prince in Theology; his 'Theological Institutes' is the noblest work in Methodism, and it is truly valuable."

Some readers have expressed themselves as somewhat disappointed on account of the copious citations with which the "Institutes," especially in the latter part of the first volume, abounds. To this complaint, Dr. Jackson, in his *Memoirs of Mr. Watson*, furnishes a satisfactory reply:—"The complaint rests upon no solid foundation. It would have been mere affectation and folly for the author to spend his time in original composition, merely to save appearances, when facts and arguments, every way suited to his purpose, were already prepared for him, and were beyond the reach of a considerable part of his readers; being found only in large and scarce publications. So much extract, however, occasions a degree of inequality in the style of this part of the work; and the author, some months before his death, requested his printer, (the late James Nichols, the able translator of the works of Arminius,) to give a modern dress to such of the extracts as were somewhat antiquated in style, so that the inverted commas might be laid aside, and the different authors be simply referred to in the margin. Of course, it was intended that the

*"God himself is the object of Theology. All other sciences have their objects, noble indeed, and worthy of the attention of the human mind, and in the consideration of which, time, leisure, and diligence may be occupied. But this science is the only one which is occupied about the **BEING** of beings and the **CAUSE** of causes, the principle of nature, and that of grace existing in nature, and by which nature is assisted and surrounded. Hence this object is not only the most worthy, but the most dignified of all, and full of adorable majesty."*—**ARMINIUS.**

CONTENTS

OF THE

“THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTES,” WITH REFERENCES
TO THE EDITION IN FOUR VOLUMES 12mo., AND
VOLUMES IX., X., XI., AND XII., IN MR. WATSON’S
COLLECTED WORKS.

P A R T I.		12mo.	Works,
CHAPTER I.		Vol. I.	Vol. IX.
		Page	Page Page
Man a Moral Agent		1	5 11
II.			
The Rule which determines the Quality of Moral Actions a Revelation from God ...		6	10 12
III.			
Further Presumptions of a Revelation— from the Weakness of Human Reason ...		16	19 12
IV.			
Further Proofs of the Weakness and Un- certainty of Human Reason		21	24 13
V.			
Origin of those Truths which are found in the Writings of the Heathen		31	33 14
VI.			
The Necessity of Revelation :—State of Re- ligious Knowledge among the Heathen...		61	60 14
VII.			
The Necessity of Revelation :—State of Morals among the Heathen		77	75 15
VIII.			
The Necessity of Revelation :—Religions of the Heathen		84	82 16
IX.			
The Evidences necessary to authenticate a Revelation :—External Evidence ...		101	97 17
X.			
The Evidences necessary to authenticate a Revelation :—Internal Evidence		128	121 18

	12mo, Vol. I.	Works, Vol. IX.	
XI.	<i>Page</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Page</i>
Use and Limitation of Reason in Religion	138	130	19
XII.			
Antiquity of the Scriptures	154	145	19
XIII.			
Uncorrupted Preservation of the Scriptures	197	184	20
XIV.			
The Credibility of the Testimony of the Sacred Writers	210	195	22
XV.			
The Miracles of Scripture	217	202	22
XVI.			
Objections to the Proof from Miracles ...	232	215	23
XVII.			
Prophecies of Scripture	262	242	25
XVIII.			
Objections to the Evidence from Prophecy	290	267	26
XIX.			
Internal Evidence of the Truth of Scrip- ture:—Collateral Evidence	307	282	27-30
XX.			
Miscellaneous Objections answered ...	356	325	30

P A R T I I .

CHAPTER I.

The Existence of God	398	362	35
II.	12mo, Vol. II.		
Attributes of God:—Unity—Spirituality...	1	461	39
III.			
Attributes of God:—Eternity, Omnipotence	29	486	42
IV.			
Attributes of God:—Omniscience... ..	56	Works, Vol. X.	3
V.			
Attributes of God:—Immutability, Wisdom	98	40	46
VI.			
Attributes of God:—Goodness	117	58	48
VII.			
Attributes of God:—Holiness	157	94	50

CONTENTS.

vii

	12mo, Vol. II.	Works, Vol. X.	
VIII.	Page	Page	Page
God :—The Trinity in Unity ...	174	109	52
IX.			
Trinity :—Scripture Testimony ...	203	135	54
X.			
Trinity :—Pre-existence of Christ ...	218	149	56
XI.			
Trinity :—Jesus Christ the Jehovah of the Old Testament ...	233	162	57
XII.			
The Titles of Christ ...	264	189	60
XIII.			
Christ possessed of Divine Attributes ...	377	288	69
XIV.			
The Acts ascribed to Christ Proofs of his Divinity ...	393	303	70
XV.			
Divine Worship paid to Christ ...	406	315	72
XVI.			
Humanity of Christ—Hypostatic Union...	437	343	73
XVII.			
The Personality and Deity of the Holy Ghost	455	359	75
XVIII.			
Fall of Man—Doctrine of Original Sin ...	478	379	77
	and p. 1 in		
XIX.	12mo, Vol. III.	Works, Vol. XI.	
Redemption :—Principles of God's Moral Government ...	98	3	88
XX.			
Redemption :—Death of Christ Propitiatory	121	23	90
XXI.			
Redemption :—Sacrifices of the Law ...	194	87	99
XXII.			
Redemption :—Primitive Sacrifices ...	228	117	102
XXIII.			
Benefits derived to Man from the Atone- ment :—Justification ...	286	167	107
XXIV.			
Benefits derived to Man from the Atone- ment :—Concomitants of Justification ...	378	248	116

	12mo, Works, Vol. III. Vol. XI.		
	<i>Page</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Page</i>
XXV.			
Extent of the Atonement	406	273	119
XXVI.			
The same Subject, continued	441	304	123
XXVII.			
An Examination of certain Passages of Scripture, supposed to limit the Extent of Christ's Redemption	1	378	135
XXVIII.			
Theories which limit the Extent of the Death of Christ	30	404	139
XXIX.			
Redemption :—Further Benefits	138	3	149

PART III.

CHAPTER I.

The Moral Law	166	27	153
II.			
The Duties we owe to God	185	44	156
III.			
The Duties we owe to God :—The Lord's Day	228	81	161
IV.			
Morals :—Duties to our Neighbour	254	103	164

PART IV.

CHAPTER I.

The Christian Church	327	166	173
II.			
Institutions of Christianity :—The Sacra- ments	380	212	178
III.			
The Institutions of the Church :—Baptism	391	222	179
IV.			
The Institutions of the Church :—The Lord's Supper	465	286	188

ANALYSIS
OF
WATSON'S THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTES.

GENERAL DIVISION.

- | | | |
|------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Part | I. EVIDENCES, | } of CHRISTIANITY. |
| " | II. DOCTRINES, | |
| " | III. MORALS, | |
| " | IV. INSTITUTIONS, | |

PART FIRST.

EVIDENCES OF THE DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE
HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Outline.

1. PRESUMPTIVE evidence.
 - A. That a direct revelation would be made in *some* way. (Vol. i. pp. 1—85.)
 - B. That it would be made in *this* way, i. e., in the *manner* in which Christianity professes to have been revealed. (Pp. 85—96.)
- II. DIRECT evidence, preliminary to the introduction of which are considered—
 - (1.) The kind and degree of evidence necessary to authenticate a revelation. (Pp. 97—129.)
 - (2.) The use and limitation of reason in religion;

(pp. 130-144;) after which the positive evidences are introduced under the following heads:—

(I.) EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

I. *Preliminaries.*

(A.) Antiquity of the Scriptures. (Pp. 145-183.)

(B.) Uncorrupted preservation of the books of Scripture. (Pp. 184-194.)

C. Credibility of the testimony of the sacred writers; (pp. 195-201;) which being established, of course prove the *genuineness* and *authenticity* of the books of Scripture.

II. *Argument.*

(A.) From miracles.

Real miracles were wrought. (Pp. 202-214.)

Objections to the proof from MIRACLES answered. (Pp. 215-241.)

(B.) From prophecy.

Real predictions were delivered. (Pp. 242-266.)

Objections to the proof from PROPHECY answered. (Pp. 267-281.)

(II.) INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

(A.) The excellence and beneficial tendency of the *doctrines* of Scripture. (Pp. 282-309.)

(B.) *Moral* tendency of the Scriptures. (Pp. 310-316.)

(C.) *Style and manner* of the sacred writers. (Pp. 317, 318.)

(III.) COLLATERAL EVIDENCE. (Pp. 319-324.)

And finally—

(IV.) Miscellaneous OBJECTIONS are answered. (Pp. 325-361.)

PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCE.

A. *Presumptive evidence that a direct revelation would be made in SOME way.*

I. MAN A MORAL AGENT. (Chap. i. vol. 1.)

a.) Man has always been considered capable of performing *moral actions*; which are—*voluntary actions*, having respect to some *rule*.

b.) *Antecedent* to human laws, there must have been a perception of the difference of moral actions, because many actions would be judged good or evil, were all civil codes abolished.

c.) This perception may be traced, in part, to experience and observation of the injurious tendency of vice, and the beneficial results of virtue ;—but

d.) It cannot be so traced *entirely*. There has been, among all men, a constant reference to the *will* of God, or of supposed deities, as a *rule* to determine the good or evil of the conduct of men.

We derive from these considerations two weighty presumptions: supposing the Theist to grant the existence of a Supreme Creator, of infinite power, wisdom, etc. :—

FIRST, (from a, b, and c,) That those actions which men consider *good*, have the *implied* sanction of the will of the Creator.

SECOND, That they were originally, in *some way*, enjoined as his *law*, and their contraries prohibited.

(Pp. 5-9.)

II THE RULE WHICH DETERMINES THE QUALITY OF MORAL ACTIONS MUST BE PRESUMED TO BE MATTER OF REVELATION FROM GOD. (Chap. ii. vol. 1.)

a.) Creation implies *government*—and government implies *law*—which must be *revealed*;—and a revelation of the Divine will may be made either, (1.) By significant actions, or (2.) By direct communication in *language*. The *Theist* admits that (1) has been done. The Christian admits (1) and (2) both : declaring (1) to be insufficient, and the question is, On which side is the *presumption* of truth?

b.) We assert that natural indications are insufficient for the formation of a virtuous character, and illustrate the deficiency by reference to temperance—justice—benevolence—worship—prayer—a future state, the pardon of sin. (Pp. 10–18.)

III. A is proved BY THE WEAKNESS OF HUMAN REASON AND THE WANT OF AUTHORITY IN HUMAN OPINIONS. (Chap. iii. vol. 1.)

a.) Granting that a perfect reason could determine the moral quality of actions, — Yet (1.) That perfect reason is not to be found ; (2.) Men differ greatly in their reasoning powers ; (3.) Men are not sufficiently contemplative, nor sufficiently honest, for such inquiries ; (4.) We find that men bring down the *rule* to the *practice*, rather than raise the *practice* to the *rule*.

b.) But supposing truth discovered, and intellec-

tual men appointed to teach others, what authority have they?

1. We answer *a priori*, no other authority than the *opinion* of a teacher,—which might be received or not.

2. And *facts* are sufficiently in proof of this.
—Cicero, etc. (Pp. 19–23.)

c.) *But reason, alone, cannot determine the moral quality of actions.* (Chap. iv. vol. 1.)

(1.) Reason is an erring faculty, and its exercise is limited by our *knowledge*. (2.) It is *one* thing to assent to a doctrine when discovered and proposed, and *another* to make such discovery originally. (3.) The principles of what is called *natural religion* command the assent of reason, but the question is, *Whence came they?* (4.) Certainly they were never mentioned as discoveries either by the sacred writers, or the sages of antiquity.

d.) In fact, sober views of great religious truths have been found *nowhere*, since patriarchal times, save in the sacred writings:—thus,

(1.) Existence of God. Ancient doubts. Modern Buddhists.

(2.) Creation of *matter*. Eternity of matter was the doctrine of the Ionic, Platonic, Italic, and Stoic Schools. Aristotle.

(3.) *Individuality* of the human soul.

(4.) Doctrine of *Providence*. The ancients believed in conflicting and subordinate gods.

(5.) *Immortality* of the human soul. Ancient doctrine of *absorption*. Modern Hindoo notion of *annihilation*. (Pp. 24–32.)

e.) Those truths which are found in the writings and religious systems of the heathen can be traced to revelation. (Chap. v. vol. I.)*

(1.) There was a substratum of common opinions among all early nations, in regard to facts and doctrines which are contained in the Old Testament :—thus a golden age, sacrifice, formation of the world, etc. (Pp. 33–37.)

(2.) *Adam*, a moral agent, must have had instruction from the Creator, and his knowledge might easily have been transmitted to *Noah's* time, for *Methuselah* was contemporary with both *Adam* and *Noah*. Then *after* the flood, the system would of course be propagated by *Noah's* descendants, and we find it received in the family of *Abraham*. Subsequently it was doubtless vastly diffused by the dispersions and restorations of the children of *Israel*. Nine conclusions. (Pp. 37–46.)

IV. A is proved by the NECESSITY OF REVELATION, —(Chap. vi. vol. I.)—evinced,

a.) By the *state of religious knowledge* among the heathen, with regard to the *first* principles of religion :—

1. *God*. The notion of subordinate deities obtained equally with that of one supreme God. The eternity of matter and its perversity not to be controlled even by God, were favourite opinions.

* The additional notes to this chapter are very valuable, (Pp. 47–59,) and should be studied carefully, in connection with the text.

2. *Providence.* If admitted at all, the doctrine was vitiated and counteracted by other opinions. The Epicureans denied it: Plato joined *fortune* with God, and Polytheism gave up the world to opposing and conflicting powers.
 3. *Future state.* Oriental doctrines of *transmigration* and *absorption*. Periodical destruction and renovation. Aristotle, Democritus, Heraclitus, and Epicurus either *denied* or refused to countenance the doctrine of the soul's existence after death. Cicero doubted; Pliny and Cæsar denied it; Seneca wavered. (Pp. 60-74.)
- b.) By the *state of morals* among the heathen. (Chap. vii. vol. 1.)
- (1.) Their moral and religious systems were doubtless from a common source.
 - (2.) But the *rules* had become involved in obscurity, their injunctions lacked *authority*, and the general *practices* of men had become vicious. The subject is illustrated by adverting to certain precepts of the second table, and showing that, although heathen nations have been sensible of the obligation of these, among all of them the *rule* has been perverted in theory and violated in practice.
1. *Murder and suicide.* Disregard of life among the heathen. Gladiatorial combats. Treatment of slaves and children.
 2. *Hatred and revenge.* Cicero. Aristotle.

3. *Adultery, divorce, fornication, etc.* Laws in regard to these, though acknowledged, yet grossly violated among heathen nations, even down to crimes *παῖρα φῦσιν*.
 4. *Theft and rapine.* Honesty almost unknown among the heathen.
 5. *Lying.* Menander. Plato. India. (Pp. 75-81.)
- c.) By the fact, that *their prevailing religions were destructive of morality.* (Chap. viii. vol. 1.)
1. Their gloomy superstitions fostered *ferocity and cruelty.* Human sacrifices among the ancients, and also in modern Africa, Asia, and America.
 2. Their religions were as productive of *impurity* as of bloodshed. Roman *Floralia.* Mysteries. Indian temple worship.
 3. The grossest ignorance on Divine subjects universally prevailed. (Pp. 82-85.)
- B. *Presumptive evidence that a direct revelation would be made in THIS WAY : i.e., in the manner in which Christianity professes to have been revealed.*
- a.) *A supernatural manifestation of truth should,*
1. Contain explicit information on those subjects which are most important to man ;
 2. Accord with the principles of former revelations ;
 3. Have a satisfactory external authentication ;
 4. Contain provisions for its effectual promulgation.

b.) *All these conditions are fulfilled in the Scriptures.*

1. They give information as to GOD, MAN, a MEDIATOR, PROVIDENCE, FUTURE STATE, etc.
 2. Three distinct religious systems, the *Patriarchal*, *Mosaic*, and *Christian*, harmonize in their doctrines and objects.
 3. The Mosaic and Christian revelations profess to rest on external evidence.
 4. Provision made (1.) By writing. (2.) By commemorative rites, etc. (3.) By accredited teachers. (Pp. 85-96.)
-

II. DIRECT EVIDENCE.

Two preliminaries. (Chap. ix. vol 1.)

(I.) *The evidences necessary to authenticate a revelation.*

1. EXTERNAL, principal and most appropriate: if not to the immediate recipient, at least to those to whom he communicates it. There are two branches of the external proof, *Miracles* and *Prophecy*. (Pp. 97-99.)

(a.) MIRACLES.

1. *Definition*. 1.) Popular. 2.) Philosophic. 3.) Theological. (Pp. 100, 101.)
2. *Possibility* of miracles. (Pp. 102, 103.)
3. Distinction between *real* miracles and *prodigies*. Criteria. (P. 104.)

4. Necessity of connection between even such *real miracles*, the *messenger*, and his *message*. (Pp. 106–107.)
5. *Human testimony sufficient to establish the credibility of miracles*. (P. 108.)
 - (1.) Hume's objection.
 - (2.) Replies to it by *Paley*—*Bishop of Llandaff*—*Campbell*. See also *Wardlaw*, and *Babbage's Ninth Bridgewater Treatise*.
6. *Fitness* of the evidence of miracles, as a ground of universal belief. (P. 117.)
- (b.) PROPHECY.
 1. *Possibility* not to be denied. Dilemma.
 2. *Adequateness* as a proof. (Pp. 117–120.)
2. INTERNAL. (Chap. x. vol. 1.)
 - (a.) Nature of the evidence.
 - (b.) Its rank in the scale of evidence.
 - 1 Not *necessary*: sufficient proof *without* it: but nevertheless useful.
 - 2 Not *primary*, but confirmatory. The contrary opinion not only supposes us capable of judging *fully* of the doctrines revealed, but also renders the external testimony comparatively nugatory. Two sources of this error.
 - (1.) The notion that miracles might be wrought to attest unworthy doctrines.
 - (2.) A confounding of the *rational* with the *authenticating* evidence.
 3. Not so *well adapted* to the mass of mankind as external evidence. (Pp. 121–129.)
- 3 COLLATERAL. Nature of the evidence stated. (P. 129.)

(II.) *The use and limitation of reason in religion.*

(Chap. xi. vol 1.)

(a.) USE of reason in regard to revelation.

1. To *investigate* the evidences of its divine authority.2. To *interpret* the meaning of the record.

(b.) LIMITATION.

1. It must not decide in cases where the nature of things is not known, either *by* or *without* revelation.2. The things compared must be of the *same nature*, and the comparison must be made in the *same respects*. (Pp. 130-144.)

These preliminaries being settled, we now proceed to adduce positive evidences, of which there are three heads :—

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

(I.) Preliminaries.

(A.) ANTIQUITY OF THE SCRIPTURES. (Chap. xii. vol. 1.)

a.) The PERSONS *who were the immediate instruments of these revelations, existed at the periods assigned.* Proved,

(1.) By the very existence of 1.) The Jewish polity ; and 2.) The Christian religion.

(2.) By the testimony of ancient authors.

1. As to *Moses*. Manetho, Apollonius, Strabo, Justin, Pliny, Tacitus, Juvenal, Longinus, Diod. Siculus, etc.

2. As to *Christ*. Suetonius, Tacitus. (Pp. 145–150.)

b.) The Books *which contain the doctrines are of the date assigned to them*. Proved,

(1.) *As to Old Testament*.

1. By the language in which it is written.

2. By Josephus' Catalogue.

3. By the Septuagint, and by the Samaritan Pentateuch.

4. By LESLIE'S ARGUMENT, which gives four rules for determining the truth of matters of fact, all which are applied with success to the Old Testament :—

(1) The matter of fact must be cognizable by the senses.

(2) The matter of fact must be publicly done.

(3) The matter of fact must be commemorated by monuments and outward actions,

(4) Which must date from the time of the matters of fact. (Pp. 150–160.)

(2.) *As to New Testament*.

1. By Leslie's Argument, as before.

2. By internal evidence from the narration itself.

3. Testimony of adversaries. CELSUS, PORPHYRY, HIEROCLES, JULIAN.

4. Quotations by subsequent authors, from the apostles downward. (Pp. 161–183.)

(B.) UNCORRUPTED PRESERVATION OF THE BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE. (Chap. xiii. vol. 1.)

- a.) *The Books are SUBSTANTIALLY the same as when written.* Proved,
- (1.) *As to Old Testament.* By the list of Josephus, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Pentateuch.
 - (2.) *As to New Testament.* By the catalogues of Origen, Athanasius, Cyril, etc., from A.D. 230, downward.
- b.) *But it can be shown also, that they have descended to us without any material alteration whatever.*
- (1.) *As to Old Testament.*
 1. *Before the time of Christ,* they were secured from alteration by their being generally known,—by the jealousy of the Samaritans,—by the public reading on the sabbath,—by the Chaldee Paraphrases, and the Greek version.
 2. *After the birth of Christ,* by mutual jealousy of Jews and Christians, and the general diffusion of the books.
 3. *All this is confirmed by the agreement of the manuscripts* in all important respects. (Pp. 184–190.)
 - (2.) *As to New Testament.*
 1. *From their contents.* Same facts and doctrines.
 2. *Impossibility of corruption* because of the general knowledge of the books, and mutual restraints of orthodox and heretics, Eastern Western churches.
 3. *From the agreement of the manuscripts.*

4. From the *agreement of ancient versions and quotations.* (Chap. 190–194.)

(C.) CREDIBILITY OF THE TESTIMONY OF THE SACRED WRITERS. (Chap. xiv. vol. 1.)

(1.) That they were persons of *virtuous and sober character* was never denied.

(2.) They were in *circumstances to know the truth* of what they relate. They could ~~not~~ be deceived, for instance, as to the feeding of the four thousand, gift of tongues, etc.

(3.) They had *no interest* in making good the story. Their interests all lay in the opposite direction.

(4.) Their account is *circumstantial*, and given in a learned age, when its falsity might easily have been detected. (Pp. 195–201.)

(II.) After these preliminaries, establishing the *genuineness and authenticity* of the books, it remains now to present the argument.

(A.) FROM MIRACLES. (Chap. xv. vol. 1.)

(1.) *Their reality proved.*

(a.) Definition of a *true* miracle.

(b.) *Claims* of Scriptural miracles to be considered *true*, illustrated—

1. As to those of *Moses*. Darkness, destruction of first-born in Egypt, passage of the Red Sea, falling of manna. (Pp. 202–207.)

2. As to those of *Christ*. Illustrated especially by the greatest miracle, the RESURRECTION, in regard to which it is shown,

a. That *Christ was really dead.*

b. That *the body was missing.* That

c. Every *attempt to account* for (b,) except on the supposition of a resurrection, is *absurd*, and

d. That the story was *confirmed by the subsequent* testimony and conduct of the disciples. (Pp. 207–214.)

(2.) *Objections answered.* (Chap. xvi. vol. 1.)

(a.) It is asserted that *miracles have been wrought in support of other doctrines.*

I. On the *authority of Scripture.* For, it is said,

(1.) That Scripture gives *instances* of such : e. g., of *magicians* in opposition to Moses, and the raising of Samuel by the witch of Endor, etc.

1. *As to the feats of the magicians*, it is to be noticed, 1. That they were professed wonder-workers ; 2. That they could appear to imitate but three of Moses' miracles ; 3. That their works were wrought to maintain the *equality* of their idols with *Jehovah*. Two explanations are given.

1. Some suppose these were exercises of legerdemain.

2. Our author admits a supernatural evil agency : which is not unreasonable, inasmuch as the design was, not to disprove the divinity of *Jehovah*, but to maintain their own authority.

2. *As to the witch of Endor*, and Satan's bearing our Lord through the air :—

Granting these events to have been miraculous, it cannot be shown that they were wrought in opposition to a divine mission. (Pp. 215-221.)

(2.) That Scripture *assumes the possibility of such*. Deut. xiii. 1 ; Matt. xxiv. 24 ; 2 Thess. ii. 8, 9.

1. Notice the *nature and work* of Satan.
—Six points.

2. Observe the *limitations of the power* of evil spirits, four points, (1.) No work of creation. (2.) No power of life and death. (3.) No knowledge of future events. (4.) No *certain* knowledge of the *thoughts of men*. (Pp. 221-225.)

3. Apply these considerations to show
(1.) That no *real* miracle can be performed in opposition to the truth.
Illustrated,
(1.) By the case of the Egyptian magi.
(2.) By that of false Christs, etc.
(2.) Nor any *prophecy* be uttered implying certain knowledge of future events : though great *sagacity* may be exhibited.

N.B. No evidence recorded in favour of falsehood that might not readily be refuted on the spot by counter evidence. (Pp. 225-231.)

II. On the *authority of profane writers*.
Miracles of Aristeeas, Pythagoras, Alexander

of Pontus, Vespasian, Apollonius Tyanæus, and the Romish Church.

(a.) These pretended miracles are all *deficient in evidence*.

(b.) They are *insulated* and destitute of any reasonable object: while the miracles of Scripture combine for the establishment of one system. (Pp. 232-241.)

(B.) FROM PROPHECY. (Chap. xvii. vol. 1.)

(1.) *Their reality proved.*

(a.) Preliminary considerations.

1. The instances are *numerous*.
2. Many have *clearly come to pass*.
3. They all *tend to one great end*.
4. This last characteristic is *peculiar to the Scripture prophecies*.
5. There is no *obscurity* in them that can be just ground for cavil.
6. The *double sense* of prophecy, in which one event is *typical* of another, so far from being an objection, is a confirmation of the infinite wisdom that inspired it.

(b.) Examples of such predictions. (Pp. 242-249.)

1. The prediction to *Adam of the protracted conflict between the serpent and the seed of the woman*, with the ultimate triumph of the latter.
2. Jacob's prediction respecting the *time when Shiloh* should come.
3. Predictions respecting *the Jewish nation*:

— (1.) Their apostasies. (2.) Their punishments. (3.) Their restoration. (Pp. 250–260.)

4. Predictions respecting the Messiah.

(1.) Upward of *one hundred* distinct predictions as to his birth, life, sufferings, death, and resurrection.

(2.) Wonderful prophecy, especially, contained in Isaiah liii. (Pp. 261–266.)

(2.) *Objections answered.* (Chap. xviii. vol. 1.)

(a.) It is objected to some of the prophecies, *that they were written after the event.*

This cannot be sustained : illustrated as to *Isaiah* and *Daniel*.

(b.) *The Scripture prophecies are compared to the heathen oracles.*

Let us take the *Delphic* oracle for an example.

Of this we say,

1. None of its predictions ever *went deep into futurity.*

2. *Its responses were ambiguous.*

3. Venal and servile, *it was easily corrupted.* None of which can be alleged of Scripture prophecies.

(c.) *The character of the prophets is aspersed.*

E.g., Balaam, and Jewish false prophets. Singular proceeding to condemn the *true* on account of the *false*, who were not received by the Jews themselves. (Pp. 267–272.)

(d.) *It is asserted that some of the prophecies have failed.*

1. Promise to Abraham. Ans. But this was fulfilled in the time of David and Solomon.
 2. Promise of great wealth and dominion to the Jews. (*Voltaire.*) Ans. *Civil* blessings are promised conditionally, and *spiritual* blessings are generally predicted under figures of speech.
 3. Prediction of Isaiah to Ahaz. Ans. This *was* fulfilled.
 4. Prophecy of Jeremiah to Zedekiah. Ans. This was fulfilled in all particulars, as far as we know.
 5. That of Ezekiel respecting the desolation of Egypt. Ans. We know not that it has *not* been fulfilled: and the very same prophecy contains a prediction that has been remarkably accomplished.
- (e.) *Sundry actions of the prophets have been ridiculed.* Ans. They were appropriate to the occasions, and in accordance with primitive and Oriental usage. (Pp. 273–281.)

II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

Notice two preliminaries. (Chap. xix. vol. 1.)

- (1.) The distinction between *rational* and *authenticating* evidence.

- (2.) Those doctrines which have no *rational* evidence do not suffer in authority *on that account*. (Pp. 282-283.)

We have now to consider,

- (A.) THE EXCELLENCE AND BENEFICIAL TENDENCY OF THE DOCTRINES OF SCRIPTURE. Among which are

a.) The *existence of God*—his *character, attributes, &c.*

b.) The *moral condition of man* :—

1. The race is absolutely *vicious*.

2. And vicious in consequence of a *moral taint* in their nature: for the evil is not to be accounted for by the influence of *education* or *example*, as some vainly say.

3. The *divine government*, in regard to man, is of a *mixed character*. (Pp. 283-288.)

c.) The *atonement*. Doctrine much objected to, as being deficient in rational evidence. The Christian doctrine is grounded on—

1. Future punishment, which is

2. Unlimited, for which two arguments may be assigned. (1) Present analogies. (2) Doctrine of immortality.

3. The *problem* of the possibility of pardon, without such a relaxation of the divine government as would effectually nullify it, can only be solved by this great doctrine. Repentance and reformation are not only unavailing, but would, from the nature of the case, be impracticable. Illustration, *Zaleucus*. (Pp. 288-302.)

d.) Doctrine of the *influence of the Holy Spirit*.

1. No *physical* objection to this doctrine.
2. No *moral* objection. Free agency *not* destroyed.
3. It is adapted to the *moral destitution* of man.
4. It presents an *affecting view of the divine character*.
5. It elevates our *aspirations*, and encourages us to the performance of the most difficult duties.
(Pp. 302-307.)

This branch of the internal evidence may be properly closed by noticing

- e.) The wonderful *agreement in doctrine* among the writers, though numerous, and writing at different periods. (Pp. 307-309.)

(B.) MORAL TENDENCY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

- a.) It has been asserted that the *Bible has an immoral tendency*, because it records the failings of some of its leading characters! Answered:—These frailties are always recorded for admonition; illustrated by David's case.

N. B. The moral characters of Blount, Tindal, Hobbes, Voltaire, Paine, etc., not very honourable to the cause which they espoused.

- b.) *Compare Pagan morality with that of the Scriptures.*
1. Great moral qualities attributed to the divine Being were *abstract* with them; but in *Christ* they are all exemplified.
 2. No *authority for moral rules* among Pagans.

3. Their *apprehension* of moral principles was *indistinct*.
 4. The *same writers* among heathen are of a lower grade than among Christians.
 5. Beauty and symmetry of the Christian morals. Wesley. Taylor.
- (C.) STYLE AND MANNER OF THE SACRED WRITERS.
- a.) *Style*, various, as it should be, being the productions of different individuals, in different ages. Marsh. Michaelis.
 - b.) *Manner*, artless and natural, possessing all the simplicity of truth.
 - c.) *Incidental coincidences*. (Pp. 310-318.)
-

III. COLLATERAL EVIDENCE.

- (A.) MARVELLOUS DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIANITY, especially during the first three centuries, confirmed by Tacitus, Pliny, Justin, Tertullian, Origen, until A.D. 300, when *Christianity became the established religion of the Roman empire*
- (B.) ACTUAL EFFECT PRODUCED UPON MANKIND. Moral victories over idolatry; infanticide; condition of woman; slavery, etc. (Pp. 319-324.)

IV. MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Preliminary remarks. (Chap. xx. Vol. I.)

1. Objections are often raised in great *ignorance* of the volume itself.

2. Hasty theories have been constructed, which have been found or thought to contradict the Scriptures ; thus Deism arose in the sixteenth century in France, and in the seventeenth in England.
3. HERBERT, HOBBS, SHAFTESBURY, and HUME, the chief English infidels : and the great principle of error with them all, is that of Herbert of Cherbury : — “ *the sufficiency of our natural faculties to form a religion for ourselves, and to decide upon the merits of revealed truth.*” (Pp. 325–327.)

I. Objections on *moral* grounds.

1. *The command to the Israelites to exterminate the Canaanites.*

Ans. It cannot be proved inconsistent with the character of God to employ *human agents*, as well as natural, in such a work.

2. *Law in Deuteronomy* authorizing parents to accuse their children, etc.

Ans. In fact this was a merciful regulation.

3. *Intentional offering of Isaac by Abraham.*

Ans. (1.) Abraham had no doubt of the Divine command.

(2.) He obeyed, in faith that God would raise his son.

4. *Indelicacy and immodesty* have been charged upon the Scriptures.

Ans. (1.) These sins are everywhere denounced as offensive to God.

(2.) The passages alluded to are *generally* prohibitions of crime.

- (3.) The simplicity of early manners is to be considered.

Several others might be adduced, but a little skill in the languages and antiquities of Scripture will always clear up the main difficulties. (Pp. 328-331.)

II. Objections on *philosophical* grounds.

1. Infidels are fond of contrasting—what they call
—the *simplicity* of the book of nature with the
mystery of the book of God.

Ans. (1.) Many doctrines and duties *are* comprehensible.

- (2.) Facts may be *revealed* and yet be incomprehensible: e.g., it is revealed *that God is omnipresent*, but not how he is so, etc.

- (3.) But even in their boasted *natural philosophy, revelation and mystery* go hand in hand. The real causes of the phenomena named gravitation, cohesion, evaporation, etc., are unknown; and even in *pure mathematics*, such incomprehensibles occur.

2. From the minuteness of the earth as contrasted with *the vastness of the material universe*, infidelity argues the insignificance of man; thence the improbability of redemption.

Answered, (1.) By Dr. Beattie. (2.) By Granville Penn. (Pp. 331-338.)

3. Objections are brought against the *Mosaic chronology* from two sources:

- (1.) The chronology of ancient nations.

- (2.) The structure of the earth.

As to the (1) class, these ancient chronologies

—the Hindoo, Chinese, and Egyptian, which make the greatest pretensions to antiquity, are rapidly losing character. No reliance whatever is placed upon them.

As to the (2) *geological* objection, two solutions have been offered.

1. That the *days* of the Mosaic history are indefinite periods.
2. That an indefinite time elapsed between the *beginning* spoken of in Genesis verse 1, and the 'work of the six days.

To both these solutions our author objects, and prefers the views of Mr. Granville Penn.*

4. It is objected that *light was created* on the *first* day, and the sun not until the *fourth*.

Several solutions.

5. Objections to the Mosaic account of the deluge.
6. Objections as to number of animals taken into the ark with Noah. (Pp. 339-361.)

*As the "Theological Institutes" were written before the advanced discoveries in geology, the student may consult Dr. John Pye Smith's and Professor Hitchcock's works on Scripture and Geology; also Field's Student's Handbook of Christian Theology, Chap. IV., and the articles "CREATION," "EARTH," "ARK," and "FLOOD," in Mr. Bastow's Bible Dictionary.

PART SECOND.

DOCTRINES OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Outline.

I. DOCTRINES RELATING TO GOD.

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| (A.) Existence : | (Ch. i.) |
| (B.) Attributes : | (Ch. ii-vii) |
| (C.) Persons : | |
| (I.) <i>Doctrine of Trinity,</i> | (Ch. viii, ix.) |
| (II.) <i>Divinity of Christ,</i> | (Ch. x-xv.) |
| (III.) <i>Humanity of Christ,</i> | (Ch. xvi.) |
| (IV.) <i>Personality and Deity of the</i>
<i>Holy Ghost,</i> | (Ch. xvii.) |

II. DOCTRINES RELATING TO MAN.

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| (A.) Original sin : | (Ch. xviii.) |
| (B.) Redemption : | |
| (I.) <i>Principles of,</i> | (Ch. xix-xxii.) |
| (II.) <i>Benefits of,</i> | (Ch. xxiii-xxix.) |

I. DOCTRINES RELATING TO GOD.

(Ch. i-xvii.)

(A.) EXISTENCE OF GOD.—(Ch. i. vol. 1.)

(I.) Source of the idea.

I. *From the sacred writings.*

1. From the *names* of God as recorded in Scripture :
2. From the *actions* which the Scriptures ascribe to him :
3. From the *attributes* with which they invest him. (Pp. 362-366.)

II. *From the sacred writings alone.*

1. The language of the Christian philosophers, in regard to the Deity, is very different from the inconsistent and grovelling views of the sages of antiquity : e. g., *Barrow*, *Pearson*, *Lawson*, and *Newton*, are quoted.
2. The question of man's ability to discover the existence of a first cause cannot be determined by matter of fact.
3. Nor can the abstract probability of such discovery be sustained. (Pp. 367-373.)

(1.) Uneducated man is a creature of appetite : but he cannot be educated without civilization and society :—these *have* never existed, and we may safely say, *can* never exist without a religious basis : but by the hypothesis, that basis,—the idea of God, is wanting.

(2.) Clear as the argument *a posteriori* now appears to us, yet all history shows that the *eternity of matter* has been an impassable barrier in the way of human reasoning, unaided by *revelation*, in the attempt to establish a Divine existence. (P. 377.)

(3.) The doctrine of *innate ideas*, according to our author, is exploded. (P. 378.)

(II.) Proofs.

I. Preliminary observations.

(a.) *On the relation of cause and effect.*

1. The principle is, that *nothing exists or comes to pass without an EFFICIENT CAUSE.* (Pp. 379-380.)

2. Hume, probably following Hobbes, objects to this principle on the ground, that what we suppose to be *necessary connections*, in nature, are or may be only *habitual sequences*, and that we cannot demonstrate them to be otherwise.

3. Answered by *Dugald Stewart*, who admits Hume's doctrine indeed, but nullifies its evil results, by his distinction between *efficient* and *physical* causes. (Pp. 381-384.) But

4. Our author supposes the true state of the case to be

(1.) That there are *efficient* causes and that the relation between them and their effects is *necessary*.

(2.) That there are *physical* causes, the relation between which and their effects is *necessary* in this sense, — that God has

established a certain order in nature, by which his own efficiency exerts itself. This is a very different notion from the unsatisfactory one of *habitual sequence*.

- (b.) On the distinction between the argument *a priori* and *a posteriori*. Superiority of the latter in this case. (Pp. 385-387.)

II. Proof of the *existence* of God.

1. *Locke's* argument. "I exist : I did not always exist : whatever begins to exist must have a cause : that cause must be adequate : this *adequate* cause is unlimited : it must be God."
2. *Howe's* argument : the same, but more expanded, thus :
 - (1) Somewhat hath existed from *eternity* : hence (2) must be uncaused : hence (3) independent : hence (4) necessary : hence (5) self-active, and hence (6) *originally vital*, and the *source of all life*. (Pp. 387-393.)

III. Proof of the *intelligence* of God.

1. Dr. *Sam. Clarke's* argument from the *intelligence of man*, and the *variety, order, excellence, and contrivance* of things : and especially from the existence of *motion*. (Pp. 394-400.)
2. This last—motion, expanded, from *Howe's Living Temple*. (Pp. 401-2.)
3. The basis of NATURAL THEOLOGY as found in *Howe's Living Temple*,—"Whatever exists, with the *marks of wisdom and design* upon it, had a *wise and designing CAUSE*." (P. 403.)
Illustrations,
 - (1.) A *watch*, present'd to an observer for the first time. (Pp. 407-408.)

(2.) Much more, *the heavenly bodies* exhibit wisdom and contrivance. (Pp. 409-410.)

(3.) The *human frame* especially.

1. The *double members* and their uses.

2. The *eye* with its curious optical mechanism.

3. The *spine* : and besides the frame of the body. (Pp. 410-417.)

(4.) Its *animal functions*, and those of terrestrial creatures :—(Pp. 417-420.)

1. Growth.

2. Nutrition.

3. Spontaneous motion.

4. Sensation.

(5.) *Intellectual powers of man*. (P. 421.)

4. The instances of the *watch*, the *eye*, the *double organs*, and the *spine*, largely illustrated by quotations from Paley. (Pp. 422-441.) See also Lord Brougham's Notes to Paley's Natural Theology.

IV. Proof of the *personality of God*. (Pp. 442-446.)

(III.) Remarks.

I. *Absurdity of Atheism*.

1. As to the eternity of the world.

2. As to the eternity of *unorganized matter*.

3. Some *modern schemes of Atheism* :—

(1.) Buffon's *organic molecules*.

(2.) The system of *appetencies*. No other answer necessary than that these schemes are entirely wanting in *evidence*. (Pp. 446-452.)

II. *Character of the argument a priori*.

1. It is unsatisfactory and tends to lead men away from the *sure* argument, pointed out by Scripture, from "*the things which do appear.*"
 2. The existence itself of a supreme Being can hardly be shown by this method. Indeed, even Dr. S. Clarke first proves the existence of "one unchangeable and independent Being," *a posteriori*. See also *Wardlaw's Theology*.
 3. Some objections to Dr. S. Clarke's view of the *necessary* existence of the supreme Being.
- The being of God is *necessary*, because it is *un-*derived, not *underived* because it is necessary. (Pp. 453-460.)

(B.) ATTRIBUTES OF GOD. (Ch. ii.—vii.)

I. UNITY. (Ch. ii. vol. 1.)

(I.) *Scriptural testimony*. Deut. vi. 4 ; iv. 35, etc.

1. The Scriptural notion is, that GOD is a *pure simple being*: so *one*, that there *are* no other gods: so *one*, that there *can be* no other gods.
2. If we admit the Scriptures, we admit a Deity: if we admit one God, we exclude all others. (Pp. 461-462.)

(II.) *Evidence from reason*.

1. *A priori* argument is here unobjectionable, if logical.
 - (1.) Dr. Clarke's shown to be useless.
 - (2.) *Wollaston's, Wilkins', and Pearson's* arguments stated.

- (3.) The best argument of the kind, is that from the idea of *absolute perfection*.
- 2. Proof- may be derived also from the *works* of God.
 - (1.) In the *harmony* of the universe we discern but one *Will* and one *Intelligence*, and therefore but One Being.
 - (2.) *Uniformity of plan* in the universe, is a proof of the unity of God. Illustrations by Paley. (Pp. 462-470.)
- (III.) *Importance of this doctrine.*

The unity of God the basis of all true religion.

II. SPIRITUALITY.

- (I.) *Scriptural testimony*; "GOD is a SPIRIT." Similar passages abound. The immateriality of the divine Being is important, because of its connection with the doctrine of the immortality of the human soul. (I'p. 470-472.)
- (II.) *Evidence from reason*, both as to the *spiritual* nature of God, and the *unthinking* nature of matter.
 - 1. God is intelligent, therefore GOD is a spiritual Being, because intelligence is not a property of matter. For
 - (1.) *Unorganized* matter is certainly unintelligent; hence, intelligence cannot be an *essential* property of matter: but *it is* an essential attribute of Deity, hence the Deity cannot be material.
 - (2.) Nor is *intelligence the result of material organization*, for
 - 1. *Vegetables* are unintelligent.

2. Were intellect *constantly* conjoined with animal organization, we could deny the *necessity* of such connection, but we deny this supposed constant connection, and thus take away the basis of Priestley's argument. This denial is based upon the following :

a.) The organization of the human frame is often perfect *after death*. But dead men do not think.

b.) The 'organism of Adam's body was complete before he became "a living soul." (Pp. 472-475.)

(3.) But we may be told, that the subject supposed in the argument is a *living* organized being. This introduces a new element,—*life*, into the argument: but

1. *Vegetables* live, and yet do not think.

2. The *organic* life of Bichat is common to animals and vegetables.

3. The *animal* life is defined by Bichat, Lawrence, and even by Cuvier, to be the "sum total of its functions of a certain class." Absurdity of this shown by quotations from Rennell and Barclay.

(4.) Further proofs that matter is incapable of thought, drawn from its essential properties of *extension*, *impenetrability*, *divisibility*, etc., none of which belong to thought.

(5.) The notions, *matter* and *mind*, are merely relative. Reid. Stewart. Immateriality of brutes not denied. (Pp. 475-485.)

III. ETERNITY. (Ch. iii. vol. 1.)

1. Scriptural notion, God had no beginning and shall have no end. "From everlasting to everlasting," etc.
2. These representations evidently convey something more than the mere idea of *infinite duration*. Life is *essential* to God: he lives by virtue of his own nature, which can be said of him alone.
3. Some obscure notions of the eternity prevailed among the heathen, probably derived from the Jewish Scriptures.
4. Doctrine of the *Eternal Now* repudiated.
 - (1.) Duration, as applied to God, is an extension of the same idea as applied to ourselves.
 - (2.) The objection to this, — that it would argue imperfection, — arises from the confounding *succession in the duration* with *change in the substance*.
 - (3.) If it be said that *succession* is only an artificial method of conceiving or measuring duration, it may be answered, that leagues measure the ocean, but leagues are not the ocean, though both leagues and the ocean may actually exist. (Pp. 486–494.)

IV. OMNIPOTENCE.

(I.) *Scriptural testimony.*

1. Reasons why this attribute is so much dwelt upon by the sacred writers, — to secure the *obedience, worship, and confidence* of man.
2. Mode of its exhibition in the Scriptures.
 - (a.) By the fact of *creation*.

- (b.) By the *vastness* and *variety* of the works of God.
- (c.) By the ease with which he is said to create and uphold all things.
- (d.) By the *terrible* descriptions given of the divine power.
- (e.) By the subjection of all *intelligent* beings to his will.
- 3. The power of all these descriptions lies in their *truth*.
- 4. The works of God *manifestations*, but not the *measure* of his omnipotence. (Pp. 494-499.)
- (II.) Only *limitation* to the divine power: no working of contradictions, or impossibilities. (Pp. 499--501.)

V. OMNIPRESENCE.

- 1. Scriptural testimony.
- 2. Heathen notions of omnipresence: some striking, but all defective.
- 3. Similar errors pervade the infidel philosophy of modern times.
- 4. The Scriptural phrases in which this doctrine is conveyed, must be taken in their common-sense acceptation.
- 5. Illustrations of this doctrine from the material world, quoted from Amory and Paley.
- 6. The *a priori* argument stated.
- 7. The manner in which God is everywhere present, incomprehensible. (Pp. 501--510.)

VI. OMNISCIENCE. (Ch. iv. vol. 1.)

- (I.) *Scriptural* statement of the doctrine.

1. Direct texts : "Great is the Lord, his *understanding* is INFINITE," etc.
 2. Argument in Psalm xciv., from the communication of knowledge to men, illustrated by a quotation from Tillotson.
 3. The sacred writers refer to the *works* of God for confirmation. (Pp. 510-513.)
- (II.) The *Pagans* had many fine sentiments in regard to the divine omniscience, but the *moral* of the doctrine was wanting. (Pp. 513-514.)
- (III.) The doctrine of *foreknowledge* examined. Unquestionably it is a Scriptural doctrine : but from its difficulty, etc., three theories have arisen :
- (1.) Theory of Chevalier Ramsay. "It is a matter of choice in God, to think of finite ideas." Answer to this theory,
 1. God's *omnipotence* is an infinite *capacity*, but *omniscience* actually comprehends all things that are or can be.
 2. Choice implies a *reason*, and that implies *knowledge* of the things rejected.
 3. Some *contingent* actions have been foreknown by God, and indeed foretold by his prophets. (Pp. 515-517.)
 - (2.) Theory, "that prescience of contingent events implies a contradiction, hence the absence of such prescience is no dishonour to God."

Ans.

 - (a.) This theory is defective so long as the Scriptures are allowed to contain prophecies of rewardable and punishable actions, such as

1. The long course of events connected with the destruction of Babylon.
2. The contingencies involved in the destruction of Jerusalem.
- (b.) The principle, that "*certain* prescience destroys *contingency*," cannot be sustained.
 - 1.) The *manner* of the divine prescience is indeed incomprehensible, but the *fact* is undeniably asserted in Scripture: but 2.) The principle itself is founded upon a sophism, which lies in supposing that *contingency* and *certainly* are opposed to each other: while in fact they are not; but *contingency* and *necessity*. It is *knowledge* and not *influence*. Opinions of Dr. Sam. Clarke, Dr. Copleston, and Curcellæus. (Pp. 518-528.)
- (3.) Theory, "that the foreknowledge of God must be supposed to differ so much from any thing of the kind in ourselves, that no argument respecting it can be grounded on our imperfect notions:"—maintained by Archbishop King and Dr. Copleston. Objections to this theory are,
 - (a.) The difficulty is *shifted*, not taken away.
 - (b.) These notions are dangerous:—for if, in the language of Archbishop King, "we can have no *proper notion* of the faculties we ascribe to the divine Being," we have no proper revelation of the divine character at all. (Pp. 529-532.) But, to examine more minutely, we say that this theory *introduces* difficulties, instead of removing them; and

1. It *assumes* that our notions of God are framed from the results of our *observation* of his works, etc., which is not the case : —they are derived from express revelation.
 2. We may form a *true* notion, though not an *adequate* one, of the divine perfections. To be *incomprehensible* is not to be *unintelligible*.
 3. This theory *assumes* that the nature of God is *essentially* different from the spiritual nature of man, which is not the doctrine of Scripture.
 4. Wherever the language of Scripture is metaphorical, it is distinctly so : — so that the argument drawn from the ascription of *bodily* functions, and even of human *passions*, to the divine Being fails when applied to intellectual and moral powers.
- (c.) We say then, lastly, that there is no incongruity between divine prescience and human freedom, unless *influence* be super-added to necessitate the human will. Quotation from Edwards. (Pp. 532-546.)

VII. IMMUTABILITY. (Ch. v. Vol. 1.)

- (I.) *Scriptural statement.* “Of old thou hast laid,” etc. “I am the Lord, I change not :” with parallel passages.
- (II.) *Confirmations from observation.*
 1. The stability of the general order of nature.
 2. The moral government of God, and

- (III.) This immutability is not temporary, but a sovereign, essential perfection of the Deity, as we learn from Scripture. He changes not, because he is "*the Lord*."
- (IV.) The divine immutability is not contradicted, but confirmed, by the variety of his *operations*, *regards* and *affections*, toward the same creatures under different circumstances. (Pp. 547–550.)
- (V.) Cautions are necessary against certain speculations on the divine immutability—such as, that there are no *emotions* and no *succession of ideas* with God,—or, according to Ridgeley, that "God's knowledge is independent of the object known."
1. In these, the distinction between things *possible* and things *actual* is overlooked.
 2. And also the distinction between *God's* knowledge of all possible things, and of those things to which he determined, before the creation, to give actual existence. (Pp. 551–554.)
- (VI.) The *liberty* of God is closely allied to his immutability, and a proper idea of this will correct the false notions above alluded to. (Pp. 555–556.)

VIII. WISDOM.

- (I.) The *Scriptures* testify abundantly to the nice application of God's knowledge to secure his own ends.
- (II.) A few of the *characters* of the divine wisdom, as thus exhibited.

1. It acts for *worthy* ends.
2. Its means are *simple* : great effects from few elements.
3. Variety of *equally perfect* operation. Eg.
(1.) Variety of *form*. (2.) Variety of *magnitude*.
4. The *connection and dependence* of the works of God.
5. The means by which offending men are reconciled to God,—the most eminent manifestations of the wisdom of God. (Pp. 556–564.)

IX. GOODNESS. (Ch. vi. vol. 1.)

(I.) *Scriptural testimony.*

1. It is *goodness* of nature, an essential perfection of the divine character.
2. It is *efficient* and *inexhaustible* :—it “endureth for ever.”
3. The divine Being takes *pleasure* in the exercise of it :—he “*delights in mercy*.”
4. Nothing, capable of happiness, comes from his hand, except in circumstances of *positive felicity*. (Pp. 565–567.)

(II.) *Evidence from the natural and moral world.*

- (1.) The *dark* side. 1.) Positive evils on the globe : volcanoes, sterility, etc. 2.) Diseases and sufferings of the *human race*. 3.) Sufferings and death of *animals*. (P. 568.)
- (2.) The *bright* side. 1.) *Design* of every contrivance essentially beneficial : e.g., teeth are contrived to *eat*, not to *ache*. But to this may

be objected (1) *venomous* animals, and (2) animals *preying* upon one another.

As to (1.) So far as the animal itself is concerned, the contrivance is good.

As to (2.) The following points are to be considered. 1.) Immortality on earth is out of the question. 2.) Is not death in this way better than *decay*? 3.) The system is the spring of motion and activity to brutes.

The bright side. 2.) The happiness of *animal existence*. 3.) Many alleviations of positive evils. 4.) Many ills are chargeable upon man's own misconduct. Consider an *individual* case,—the *good* circumstances about him far counterbalance all other. (Pp. 569-576.)

(3.) The theory of *optimism*:—that the *present* system is the best which the nature of things would admit.

1. The very principle of this hypothesis implies an unworthy notion of God: considering it (1) as to *natural*, (2) as to *moral* evils.
2. We deny, then, that “whatever is is *best*.” We can not only *conceive* a better state of things, but can show that the evils of the present state do not *necessarily* exist. *Sin* has entered into the world, and God is *just*, as well as *good*.
3. The state of the world exactly answers to the Scriptural representations of the relations between man and God. Illustrated by

quotations from Gisborne: 1.) As to the actual appearance of the globe. 2.) By reference to the general deluge. 3.) By the human frame. 4.) By the occupations of man — farmers—shepherds—miners—manufacturers—merchants. (Pp. 576–588.)

(III.) The *origin of evil*. There are four leading opinions.

1. Necessity: 2. The Manichean doctrine of duality: 3. The doctrine that God is the author of sin: and 4. That evil is the result of the *abuse of moral freedom*.

1. Refutes itself: 2. Is now given up: 3. Found among the most unguarded Calvinistic writers, but now generally abandoned: 4. Is the opinion generally adopted, and agrees with the Scriptural statement of the creation and fall of man. (Pp. 588–598.)

(IV.) The *mercy* of God is a mode of his goodness. (Pp. 598–600.)

X. HOLINESS. (Ch. vii. Vol. 1.)

Preliminary. 1. It is clear that God “loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity.”

2. And this from some *essential* principle of his nature. This principle we call *holiness*, which exhibits itself in two great branches. (Pp. 601–604.)

(I.) JUSTICE. 1. *Character of*, when *particular*, (not universal.)

(a.) Legislative, which determines man's duty and binds him to its performance.

(b.) Judicial or distributive, which respects rewards and punishments : and is either 1) *præmiative*, or 2) *vindictive*, but always impartial.

2. *Reconciled with the divine administration.*

(a.) By the fact that man is under a dispensation of mercy.

(b.) By the doctrine of *general judgment*, which is grounded on that of redemption.

3. *Inferences.*

(a.) That great offenders may prosper *in this life*, without impeachment of God's government.

(b.) That God's children may be afflicted and oppressed.

(c.) That an administration of grace may be apparently *unequal* without *injustice*. But,

(d.) As *nations* have no posthumous existence, national rewards and punishments have been in all ages visible and striking. (Pp. 604-611.)

(II.) TRUTH, which in Scripture is contemplated under the two great branches of *veracity* and *faithfulness*.

1. His *veracity* regards his *word*. No deception here.

2. His *faithfulness* regards his *engagements*, which never fail.

A few general ascriptions of excellence may here be noticed. 1.) God is *perfect*. 2.) God is *all-sufficient*. 3.) God is *unsearchable*. Support each by Scriptural passages. (Pp. 611-615.)

(C.) PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD.

(1.) DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY. (Ch. viii. ix. Vol. II.)

I. *Preliminary* remarks and explanations.

1. This doctrine cannot be *demonstrated* either a priori, or a posteriori. Attempts of Poiret, Kidd, etc., noticed. It rests entirely on Scripture.
2. Pretensions to *explain* this doctrine are highly objectionable.
3. Perhaps it may be admitted, that *types* and *symbols* of the mystery of the Trinity are to be found in natural objects.
4. Explanation of the term *person*: 1.) In ordinary language. 2.) In a strict *philosophical* sense. It is not applied in the latter sense to the divine Being: but the distinct *persons* are represented as having a common foundation in *one being*:—the *manner* of the union being incomprehensible. Objection to the term, as not being Scriptural, answered.
5. Leading differences of opinion among the orthodox. Howe, Waterland, Pearson, Bull. (Pp. 1-7.)

II. *Importance* of the doctrine stated, chiefly in answer to Dr. Priestley.

1. The knowledge of God is fundamental to religion.
2. Dr. Priestley allows its necessity “to explain some particular texts.” But we can show that these “texts” comprehend a large portion of Scripture.

3. Our views of God as the object of our worship are affected.
4. Dr. Priestley objects, "that *no fact in nature, nor purpose in morals*, requires this doctrine."
 - 1.) *As to the natural world*, (1.) It is adapted to the scheme of orthodox Christianity, and *not* to Socinianism, which does not admit of redemption. (2.) The *duration* of the natural world, is another relation to theology. It was *made* for Christ.
 - 2.) *As to morals*. (1.) Morals are conformity to a divine law, which must take its character of its author. (2.) *Faith* is obedience to *command*, and therefore part of morals. (Pp. 7-14.)

III. Importance of this doctrine, on broader grounds.

1. Our *love to God*, which is the substance of religion, is essentially affected by our views of this doctrine.
2. In other equally essential views, the denial of Christ's divinity essentially alters the Christian, scheme, as—
 - 1.) The doctrine of *atonement* is denied by Socinians, though inconsistently admitted by Arians.
 - 2.) Views of the *evil of sin* are essentially modified.
 - 3.) The character of *Christian experience* essentially changed, as to *repentance, faith, prayer, love, etc.*
 - 4.) The *religious affections* of *hope, trust, joy, etc.*, are all interfered with.

5.) *The language of the church of Christ* must be altered and brought down to these views.

6.) The doctrine of *divine* agency must be changed.

3. The denial of the doctrine of the Trinity *affects the credit of the Holy Scriptures*: for if this doctrine be not contained in them, their tendency to *mislead* is obvious. (Pp. 14–24.)

IV. *Difficulties* are said to attend the reception of this doctrine.

1. Mere difficulty in conceiving of what is proper to God, forms no objection.

2. No *contradiction* is implied in this great doctrine.

3. The *Arian* and *Socinian* hypotheses do not relieve us from difficulties. (Pp. 25–26.)

V. *Scripture testimony*. (Ch. ix. vol. II.)

Preliminary. Every argument in favour of the Trinity flows from the principle of the absolute UNITY of God, which is laid down in the Scriptures with the utmost solemnity, and guarded with the utmost care by precepts, threatenings, and promises. But in examining what the Scriptures teach concerning this ONE GOD, we find that,

A. *The very names of God have plural forms and are connected with plural modes of speech.*

Examples: Deuteronomy vi. 4; Elohim, Adonim, etc. (Pp. 27–31.)

B. *Three persons and three ONLY are spoken of in Scripture under divine titles.*

Ex. 1. Solemn form of Jewish benediction. (Num. vi. 24—27.)

2. The vision of Isaiah, with the allusions to it by St. John and St. Paul, in the New Testament.

3. Various passages in the New Testament might be cited—in which sometimes *two*, sometimes *three*, but never more than three persons are spoken of. 1 John v. 7, is laid out of the argument, as uncertain. (Pp. 31–36.)

C. *The great proof on which the doctrine rests:—* the multiplied instances in which *two* persons are spoken of, as associated with God in his perfections.

1. The outline of Scriptural testimony is given, *as to the SON.*

2. The same *as to the SPIRIT.*

Therefore, as the Scriptures uniformly declare but ONE GOD, and yet do throughout declare *three persons* DIVINE, — we harmonize these apparently opposite doctrines in the proposition—THE THREE PERSONS ARE ONE GOD. These views are maintained in the orthodox church, and are chargeable with no greater mystery than is assignable to the Scriptures. We do not give up the *unity of God*. The Socinian unity is a unity of *one*: ours is a *unity of three*. (Pp. 36–40.) See also *Mansell's* Limits of Religious Thought Examined, Lecture VI; and *Wardlaw's* Systematic Theology.

(II.) DIVINITY OF CHRIST, (Ch. x.-xv.) proved,

- A. BY HIS PRE-EXISTENCE, (Ch. x.)
- B. BECAUSE HE WAS THE JEHOVAH OF
THE OLD TESTAMENT. (Ch. xi.)
- C. BECAUSE DIVINE TITLES ARE ASCRIBED
TO HIM, (Ch. xii.)
- D. BECAUSE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES BELONG
TO HIM, (Ch. xiii.)
- E. BECAUSE DIVINE ACTS ARE ASCRIBED
TO HIM, (Ch. xiv.)
- F. BECAUSE DIVINE WORSHIP IS PAID
TO HIM, (Ch. xv.)

A. PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST. (Ch. x. vol. II.)

The *pre-existence of Christ*, if established, though it does not affect the *Arian*, destroys the *Socinian* hypothesis: hence both ancient and modern Socinians have bent all arts of interpretation against those passages which expressly declare it, of which the following are examples.

1. John i. 15, "He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he *was before me*." The Socinians interpret the last clause in the sense of *dignity*, and not of *time*. But John uses the same phrase elsewhere in regard to priority of time. If the last referred to the *dignity* of Christ, it would have been *εστί*, not *ην*,—*he is*, not *he was*.

2. The passages which express that Christ came down from heaven.

(1.) The early Socinians supposed that Christ was translated to heaven after his birth. Unsupported by Scripture.

(2.) The modern Socinians conveniently resolve the whole into figure:—1. *Ascending* into heaven. 2. *Coming down* from heaven.

3. John vi. 62, “What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?”

4. The phrase, to “be *sent from* God.”

5. John viii. 58, “Before Abraham was, I am.”

6. John xvii. 5, “The glory which I had with thee before the world was.”

It has thus been shown that Christ had an existence *previous to his incarnation, and previous to the very foundation of the world.* (Pp. 41–53.)

B. JESUS CHRIST THE JEHOVAH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.” (Ch. xi. vol. II.)

In the Old Testament, we cannot fail to notice the frequent *supernatural appearances* to the ancient patriarchs and prophets. The facts cannot be disputed; and in order to show their bearing upon the question of the divinity of Christ, we have three propositions to establish:—

I. *The person who made these appearances was truly a DIVINE PERSON.*

1. *Proof.* He bears the *names* of the divine Being, and was the object of worship to the Israelites. (1.) *Hagar* in the wilderness. (2.) *Abraham* in the plains of Mamre. (3.) *Isaac* and *Jacob*. (4.) The same *Jehovah* visible to *Moses*. (5.) The same *JEHOVAH* attended the Israelites and was the object of worship and of trust.

2. *Objections.* (1.) This personage is called "the Angel of the Lord." Ans. *Angel* is a designation of *office*, not of nature. The collation of a few passages will show that *JEHOVAH* and the *Angel of the Lord*, in this eminent sense, were the same person. (2.) The *Arian* hypothesis is that the angel was not *Jehovah*, but *Christ*, personating the Deity. Shown to be untenable. (3) The *Socinian* notion is the marvellous doctrine of *occasional personality*, to use *Priestley's* term. Mysterious and absurd enough. (Pp. 54-62.)

II. *This divine person was NOT God the Father.*

1. The argument from the passage, "*No man hath seen God*," etc., is plausible, but cannot be depended upon.

2. The real argument is from the appellation *angel*. (Pp. 62-64.)

III. *This divine person WAS the promised Messiah, and consequently JESUS CHRIST.*

(1.) *Scriptural proof.*

1. *Jeremiah* asserts, that the new cove-

nant was to be made by the same person who made the old "*Behold the days come,*" etc.

2. Malachi's striking prediction, "*Behold I will send my messenger,*" etc. This prophecy is expressly applied to Christ, by St. Mark.
3. "*The voice of him that crieth,*" etc. Here the application of the prophecy was expressly made to our Lord by the Baptist.
4. "*Behold a virgin shall conceive,*" etc. "*Unto us a child is born.*"
5. Psalm lxxviii. is applied by St. Paul to Christ.
6. *Christ* is represented by St. Peter, as preaching by his Spirit in the days of Noah.
7. St. Paul; 1 Cor., x. 9, "*Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted.*"
8. Heb. xii. 25, 26, "*See that ye refuse not him that speaketh.*" (Pp. 65-75.)
- (2.) Confirmation by the *testimony of the fathers* : — Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens, Origen, Theophilus, Cyprian, Hilary, and Basil. (Pp. 76-78.)
- 3.) *Two objections* to this doctrine from Scripture are easily answered.
 1. "*God who at sundry times,*" etc. Ans. We do not allow the occasional manifestation of the Father to be recorded in the Old Testament.

2. "*If the word spoken by angels, etc.* Here the apostle refers to the *judicial* law which was given through angels. They were not the *authors* of the law, but the medium of its communication to men. (Pp. 78-80.)

C. DIVINE TITLES ASCRIBED TO CHRIST. (Ch. xii. vol. II.)

If the titles given to Christ in the Scriptures are such as can designate a divine Being, then is Christ *divine*, otherwise the Scriptures *deceive*.

I. The title JEHOVAH.

Instances of this have already been given, and indeed Socinians admit the fact by their attempts to explain it away :—thus Dr. Priestley asserts that the name JEHOVAH is sometimes given to *places*. Miserable pretence. Force of the argument distinctly stated. (Pp. 81-84.)

II. The title LORD, (Κύριος) which is applied to *Christ* in the New Testament, is in its *highest sense* universally allowed to belong to God :—and we can show, that it is applied to *Christ* in this *highest sense*.

1. Both by the LXX., and the writers of the New Testament, it is the term by which the name JEHOVAH is translated.
2. When the title is not employed in the New Testament to render the name *Jehovah*, it is still manifest, by the context, that the writers considered and used it as a *divine* title. (Pp. 84-88.)

III. The title GOD. It is admitted even by Socinians that Jesus Christ is called God. We have then to show,

1. *That in its highest sense, the term GOD involves the notion of absolute divinity.* Sir I. Newton and Dr. S. Clarke consider it a *relative* term, importing, strictly, nothing more than *dominion*.

Ans. (1.) By Dr. Waterland. (2.) By Dr. Randolph.

2. *That the term is found used of Christ in this highest sense.* (Pp. 88-93.)

(1.) Matt i. 23, "EMANUEL—God with us."

The Socinians object to this passage, 1.) That it is of doubtful authority, — but this objection rests on, confessedly, a narrow foundation. 2.) That the divinity of Christ can no more be argued from the name of EMANUEL, than the divinity of Eli, whose name signifies "*my God*." But this was the *common* name of Eli,—not so Emaruel, which was a *descriptive* title, given by revelation.

(2.) Luke i. 16, 17, "And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the LORD THEIR GOD," etc.

(3.) John i. 1, "In the beginning was the Word, and the WORD was with God, and the Word was God," etc. 1.) The *Logos* in this passage is called God in the highest sense. Three reasons. 2.) Criticism on the Greek article, annexed by Dr. Middleton. 3.) Socinians assert that *γίνομαι* never

signifies to *create*. Ans. It is thus used in the following passages: Heb. iv. 3; Heb. xi. 3; James iii. 9. 4.) They translate the passage also, "All things were made *for* him." This interpretation effectually destroys the other. But *éuá* with a genitive, denotes not the *final*, but the *efficient* cause.

- (4.) John xx. 28, "Thomas answered . . . my Lord and my God." Socinians make this a mere ejaculation!
- (5.) Titus ii. 13, "Looking for that blessed hope . . . great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."
- (6.) Heb. i. 8, "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." Two Socinian objections answered.
- (7.) 1 John v. 20, "This is the true God and eternal life."
- (8.) Rom. ix. 5, "Whose are the fathers . . . God blessed for ever." 1.) Four points to be noted in regard to this text. 2.) All attempts to weaken the force of this powerful passage have failed. (Pp. 94-110.)

IV. The title "KING OF ISRAEL." The writers of the New Testament could not use this appellation in a lower sense than that which it holds in the Old Testament: it is sufficient to show that it was understood by the Jews, to imply *divinity*. 1.) Nathanael's exclamation, and 2.) The expressions of the revilers at the

crucifixion, are sufficient proofs of this. (Pp. 110-111.)

V. The title "SON OF GOD," demands a larger notice, inasmuch as Socinians restrain its significance to the *mere humanity* of Christ, and many who hesitate not to admit the divinity of Christ, coincide with the Socinians as to the Sonship. This subject is treated as follows :

The fact is not disputed, that the title Son of God was applied to Christ. The question then is, *what this title imported*. One opinion is,

(I.) That the title was assumed by Christ because of his *miraculous conception*. But

1. Our Lord always permitted the Jews to consider him the son of Joseph.
2. When arguing with the Jews, expressly to establish that God was his father, Christ made no reference to the miraculous conception.
3. Nathanael knew not but Christ was the son of Joseph, yet called him "*The Son of God*, and the King of Israel."

The confession of Peter, "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God*," was made without reference to the miraculous conception : and probably before that fact was made known to the apostles. (Pp. 112-114.)

(II.) Another opinion is, that the title, "SON OF GOD," was simply an appellation of Messiah ; an *official*, not a *personal* desig-

nation. But the evangelical history fully refutes this notion, by showing that the Jews regarded the title "SON OF GOD" as *necessarily* involving a claim to divinity, but did not so regard "MESSIAH." (Pp. 115-116.)

(III.) In the *Old Testament*, we find that the title "Son of God," was a *personal* designation: that the Sonship was *essential*—but the Messiahship *accidental*.

1. Psa. ii., "Thou art my SON, this day have I begotten thee." (1.) This cannot be interpreted with reference to the miraculous conception. (2.) Nor with reference to the resurrection; for 1.) Christ was asserted to be the "beloved *Son*," *before* his resurrection, and 2.) Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, tells us that the resurrection of Christ was the *declaration* of his Sonship—not the *ground* of it. Argument corroborated by a quotation from Witsius.

2. Proverbs viii. 22. Solomon introduces the *personal* wisdom of God, under the same relation of a *Son*.

The ancient Jewish writers speak of the *generation* of "*Wisdom*," and by that term, mean "*the Word*."

3. Micah v. 2, "But thou, Bethlehem Ephrata," etc. This passage carefully distinguishes the human nature from the eternal generation:—as *two* goings forth

are spoken of, 1.) A natural one, "*from Bethlehem to Judah*;" 2.) Another and higher "*from the days of eternity*."

The glosses of Priestley and others, which would make this passage refer to the *promises* or *purpose* of God from everlasting, are shown to be absurd.

4. Prov. xxx. 4, "What is his name, and what is his *Son's* name," etc. Here there is no reference to Messiahship.

Thus the Scriptures of the Old Testament furnished the Jews with the idea of a personal Son in the divine nature. (Pp. 116-127.)

(IV.) The same ideas of divine Sonship are suggested in the *New Testament*.

1. "When Jesus was baptized . . . This is my *beloved Son*, in whom I am well pleased." (1.) This name, Son of God, was not here given with reference to the *resurrection*. (2.) Nor with reference to the *Messiahship*; nor (3.) With reference to the *miraculous conception*. It must follow then that CHRIST was, in a higher nature than his human, and for a higher reason than an *official* one, the "Son of God." (Pp. 128-131.)
2. The epithet, "*only begotten*," affords further proof of the Sonship of Christ in his divine nature.
3. Those passages which declare that all things were made by "*the Son*," and that God "*sent his Son*," imply that the Creator

was the Son of God before he was sent into the world.

It is assumed, but not proved, by some, that the title Son is thus applied by a mere interchange of titles between the human and divine nature.

4. Those passages *which connect the title "Son" immediately, and by way of eminence with the divinity*, remain to be considered. (P. 545.) Such are — "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," John v. 17.—"I and my Father are one," John x. 30.—"Art thou *the Son of God*?" Ans. by Christ. "Ye say that I am." (Pp. 131-138.)

5. In the *apostolic writings*, we find equal proof that the title "Son of God" was used even by way of *opposition* to the human nature. (1.) Rom. i. 3, 4, "Declared to be the Son of God with power," etc. (2.) The apostle's argument in the first chapter of Epistle to Hebrews. (3.) Rom. viii. 3, "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." (4.) "Moses was faithful as a *servant*, but Christ as a *Son*." (5.) All those passages in which the *first person* is called the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Recapitulation of the argument. (Pp. 138-145.)

(V.) *Importance* of the admission of the eternal filiation of our Lord."

Some divines, believing the divinity of Christ,

have yet opposed the eternal Sonship—but they have nearly, if not quite, adopted Unitarian modes of interpretation: and on a point confessedly fundamental, they differ from the opinions held by the orthodox church in all ages. The following consequences, in the opinion of our author, of denying the divine filiation of Christ are worthy of note :

1. A loose method of interpretation.
 2. The destruction of all *relation* among the persons of the Godhead.
 3. The loss of the Scriptural idea that the Father is the *fountain* of Deity.
 4. The same of the perfect *equality*, and yet *subordination* of the Son.
 5. The overthrow of the doctrine of the love of the Father, in the gift of his Son.
- Episcopius's argument. (Pp. 146-152.)

(VI.) *Objections* to the divine Sonship considered. (Pp. 153-157.) See also *M. Stuart's* Letters to Dr. Miller, on the Eternal Generation of the Son of God, Andover, 1822: and his Letters to Dr. Channing on the Trinity; also *Wardlaw's* Systematic Theology. Vol. II. pp. 32-59.

VI. The title WORD. Used principally by the evangelist John. Two inquiries arise here—

I. *Whence the evangelist drew the appellation?*
Ans.

- (1. From the *Scriptures* of the Old Testament: by quotations from which it is shown to be a *theological* and not a *philo-*

sophic title : and one which had received the stamp of inspiration. a. Genesis xv. 1. b. Psal. xviii. 30. c. 1 Samuel iii. 21. d. 2 Samuel vii. 21 ; 1 Chron. xvii. 19.

(2.) The *Targums* further evince the theological origin of this appellation. Illustrated by a number of quotations and references.

(3.) Philo and the philosophic Jews, then, may be spared in this inquiry, but it can be shown, 1. That if Philo possessed the idea of a personal Logos, he did not derive it from Plato. 2. That he *did* derive it from the established theology of his nation. (Pp. 158-171.)

II. *What reasons led the evangelist to adopt this appellation ?*

It is supposed John wrote with a view to the suppression of the Gnostic heresy : in order to afford the clearest refutation of those who denied the pre-existence of Christ.

III. *Argument from its use, against Socinianism.*

1. St John says, the Logos "was that light, but John Baptist was not." Here is a parallel between *two persons*—not between a *person* and an *attribute*.

2. The Logos became man. But how could an *attribute* become man ?

The personality of the Logos being established, his divinity follows of course. (Pp. 171-179.)

D. CHRIST POSSESSED OF DIVINE ATTRIBUTES.

(Ch. xiii. vol. II.)

God is made known to us by his *attributes*. Should, then, the same attributes be found ascribed in Scripture to *Christ*, we infer directly, that *Christ* is *God*.

- I. ETERNITY is ascribed to Christ. (1.) Isaiah ix. 6. (2.) Rev. i. 17, 18. (3.) Rev. i. 8. (4.) Hebrews xiii. 8. (5.) Hebrews i. 10—12. (6.) “Eternal life.” (Pp. 180-183.)
- II. OMNIPRESENCE is ascribed to him. (1.) “No man hath ascended up to heaven,” etc. (2.) “Where two or three are gathered together,” etc. (3.) “Lo, I am with you always,” etc. (4.) “By him all things consist.” (Pp. 183-186.)
- III. OMNISCIENCE is ascribed to Christ. Two kinds of knowledge *peculiar* to God.
 1. A perfect knowledge of the thoughts and intents of the human heart. This is expressly attributed to Christ. (1.) “*He knew what was in man.*” (2.) The word of God is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. (3.) Interpretation of Mark xiii. 32.
 2. The knowledge of futurity. This is also ascribed to Christ, John vi. 64, and xiii. 11, and all the *predictions* uttered by him, and which are nowhere referred by him to *inspiration*, are in proof of his possessing this attribute. (186-193.)
- IV. *Omnipotence* is ascribed to Christ. (1.) Rev. i. 8. (2.) To the Jews he said, “What things soever

the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise."

(3.) All the Scriptural argument from the ascription of divine attributes to Christ, may be summed up with his own remarkable declaration, "All things which the Father hath are mine," John xvi. 15. (Pp. 193-194.)

E. DIVINE ACTS ARE ASCRIBED TO CHRIST.

(Ch. xiv. vol. II.)

I. *Creation*. Socinians admit that creation out of nothing is the work of a divine power, and therefore interpret those passages of the New Testament which speak of Christ as a *Creator*,—as referring to a *moral* creation, or to the *regulation* of all things in the evangelical dispensation. Absurdity of this.

1. The creation of "all things" is ascribed to Christ, in the introduction to St. John's Gospel. This can only be understood of a physical creation.

2. "By whom also he made the worlds," Heb. i. 2.

Two Socinian glosses are offered.

(1.) To render the words, "*for* whom also," etc.

But *δια* with a genitive, never signifies the *final cause*, setting aside the absurdity of the worlds being made for a mere man.

(2.) To understand "the worlds" — *τοὺς αἰῶνας* —for the gospel dispensation; but the same phrase is used in the eleventh chapter,—where it can only be understood of a *physical* creation:—and in the close of the first chapter, the

apostle reiterates the doctrine of the creation of the world by Jesus Christ.

3. Coloss. i. 15—17, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by him were all things created," etc.

Socinian gloss.—"Here is meant the great change introduced into the moral world by the dispensation of the gospel."

- (1.) The Arian notion, that by "first-born," is meant "first-created," is easily refuted. As to *date* of his being, he was "before all created things."—As to the *manner* of it, he was by *generation* not *creation*.

- (2.) As for the Socinian gloss, it makes the apostle say, that Christ was the first-made member of the Christian church, and the reason for this is, that he made the church! (Pp. 195–204.)

II. The *preservation* of the universal frame of things is ascribed to Christ.

III. The final *destruction* of material nature is also expressly attributed to him.

IV. Our Lord claims, generally, to perform the works of his Father: also to possess original miraculous powers.

V. He promises to send the *Holy Spirit*.

VI. The *forgiveness of sins*, unquestionably a peculiar act of Deity, was claimed by Christ. (Pp. 204–206.)

F. DIVINE WORSHIP PAID TO CHRIST.

(Ch. xv. vol. II.

(a.) *The fact established.*

I. Prior to his ascension.

- 1.) The case of the *leper*. 2.) Of the blind man.
- 3.) The disciples.

N.B. Our Lord did not receive these acts of worship as a *civil ruler*. (Pp. 207-209.)

II. Subsequent to his ascension.

- 1.) Luke xxiv. 51, 52, "He was parted from them, and carried up into heaven, *and they worshipped him*, etc. 2.) The prayer of the apostles, when filling up the place of Judas. 3.) Supplications of Stephen, the protomartyr. Futility of the Socinian gloss, and that of Dr. Priestley 4.) Paul's prayer, when afflicted with the "thorn in the flesh." 5.) Paul's prayer in behalf of the Thessalonians. (Pp. 209-214.)

III. Adoration of Christ among heavenly beings.

- 1.) "Let all the angels of God worship him," Psalm xcvi. Horsley's remarks. 2. Psalm lxxii. 3.) The book of Revelation. (Pp. 214-219.)

IV. All the *doxologies* to Christ, and all the benedictions made in his name, in common with those of the Father and the Holy Spirit, are forms of worship.(b.) *Its bearing examined.*

1. From the avowed *religious sentiments* of the apostles, they could not pay religious worship

to Christ, unless they considered him a divine person.

2. We collect the same from their *uniform practice*.
3. 'The Arian doctrine of *supreme* and *inferior* worship refuted by Dr. Waterland.
4. The Socinians, more consistently, refuse to "honour the Son as . . . the Father." The passage, Philip. ii. 5—7, is shown to contain the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, without which it cannot be rationally interpreted. (Pp. 219—234.)

(III.) PERSON OF CHRIST. (Ch. xvi. vol. II.)

I. HUMANITY of *Christ*. In the early church it was necessary to establish that Christ possessed a real human nature. Notice the following

1. *Erroneous opinions*. 1.) The Gnostics denied the real existence of the *body* of Christ. 2.) The Apollinarian heresy rejected the existence of a human *soul* in our Lord. 3.) Among those who held the union of the two natures in Christ, there were various opinions—those of the Nestorians, Monophysites, and Monothelites.
2. The *true sense* of Scripture was given by the *council of Chalcedon* in the fifth century:—with whose formula the Athanasian Creed agrees, and the orthodox church has adopted this creed. Certainly, without keeping in view the *completeness* of each nature, we shall

find it impossible, in many places to apprehend the sense of the Scriptures. (Pp. 235-239.)

II. *The UNION of the two natures of Christ in one hypostasis* is equally essential to the full exposition of the Scriptures. The following passages illustrate this.

1. "The Word was made *flesh*," John i. 14.
2. "The church of *God*, which he hath purchased with *his own blood*," Acts xx. 28.
Digression—to examine Dr. John Pye Smith's view of orthodox language.
3. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead *bodily*," Col. ii. 9.
4. "When he had *by himself* purged our sins," etc., Heb. i. 3.

These and similar passages may be embraced under the two following classes: 1.) Those which speak of the *efficacy* of the sufferings of Christ for remission of sins. 2.) Those which argue from the compassion, etc., of our Lord, to the exercise of confidence in him. (Pp. 239-248.)

III. *Errors as to the person of Christ.*

1. Arianism: so called from its author Arius, whose characteristic tenet was that Christ was the first and most exalted of creatures.
2. Sabellianism: which, asserting the divinity of the Son and the Spirit, and denying the personality of both, stands equally opposed to Arianism and Trinitarianism.
3. Socinianism, in which the two former are now nearly merged. This last has been fully refuted by the establishment of the Scripture

doctrine of a trinity of divine persons in the unity of the Godhead, which involves a refutation of the other two heresies. (Pp. 248-250.)

(IV.) PERSONALITY AND DEITY OF THE HOLY GHOST. (Ch. xvii. vol. II.)

I. As to the *manner* of the Being of the Holy Ghost — the orthodox doctrine is, that as Christ is God by an eternal FILIATION, so the Spirit is God by PROCESSION from the Father and the Son. The doctrine of procession, our author thinks, rests on direct Scripture authority, as stated by Bishop Pearson.

1. "Even the Spirit of truth, which PROCEEDETH from the Father," John xv. 26.
2. The very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the FATHER, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the SON.

II. *Arius* regarded the Spirit as created by Christ : but afterward his followers considered the Holy Ghost as the *exerted energy* of God, which notion, with some modifications, is adopted by Socinians. (Pp. 251-254.)

III. *Scriptural argument* for the personality and Deity of the Holy Ghost.

- (a.) From the frequent association in Scripture of a *person*, under that appellation, with two other persons, one of whom, "the *Father*," is by all acknowledged to be divine; and the as-

cription to *each*, or to the three in *union*, of the same acts, titles, authority, and worship, in an equal degree.

1. Association of the three persons in *creative acts*.
2. Do. in the *preservation* of all things.
3. Do. in the *inspiration* of the prophets.
4. Do. as objects of supreme worship.
5. Do. in the form of baptism. (Pp. 254–263.)

(b.) Some other arguments, for

- (1.) The *personality* of the Spirit. 1.) He *proceeds* from the Father and Son, and cannot therefore be *either*. 2.) Many scriptures are absurd, unless the Holy Ghost be a person. 3.) The Holy Ghost is spoken of in many passages where mere personification is impossible. 4.) The use of *masculine* pronouns and relatives in the Greek of the New Testament, in connection with the *neuter* noun πνεῦμα—Spirit.
- (2.) The *divinity* of the Spirit. 1.) He is the subject of blasphemy. 2.) He is called *God*. 3.) He is the source of *inspiration*. (Pp. 263–270.) See also *Treffry* on the Eternal Sonship of our Lord; *Wardlaw's* Systematic Theology; and Professor *M. Stuart's* Letters to Dr. Channing on the Trinity, in his *Miscellanies*, 1846.

II. DOCTRINES RELATING TO MAN.

(Ch. xviii-xxix.)

(A.) ORIGINAL SIN.

- I. *Man's primitive condition.*
- II. Testimony of Scripture as to the fall of man.
- III. *Results of the fall, to Adam and his posterity.*
(Pp. 271-384. vol II.)

I. MAN'S PRIMITIVE CONDITION.

(I.) Adam was made under *law*, as all his descendants are born under law.

1. There is evidence of the existence of a *moral* as well as a *natural* government of the *universe*.

2. The *law* under which all moral agents — angels, devils, or men — are placed there is reason to believe, is, in its great principles, the *same*.

3. Each particular law supposes the general one. *Law* was not *first* introduced into the world when the law of Moses was engraven on the tables of stone. (Pp. 271-277.)

(II.) The history of *man's creation* in brief.

1. The *manner* of the narration indicates something peculiar and eminent in the being formed. "And God said, Let us make man in our image," etc.

2. The *image* of God—in what did it consist?

(1.) Not in the *body*.

- (2.) Not in the *dominion* granted to man in this lower world.
- (3.) Nor in any *one* essential quality : as the evidence of Scripture is sufficiently explicit, that it comprises what may be lost and regained.
- (4.) But, theologically speaking, we have
 - (a.) The *natural* image of God—consisting of *spirituality, immortality, and intellectual powers.*
 - (b.) The *moral* image, proved from the following passages of Scripture. (1.) Eccl. vii. 29, "God made man *upright.*" (2.) Col. iii. 10. (3.) Eph. iv. 24. (4.) "And God saw . . . and behold it was very good." Gen. i. 31. (Pp. 277–285.)
- (5.) As to the *degree* of Adam's perfection in the moral image of God, there are two extreme opinions. Without falling into either of these, we have the following conclusions :—
 - 1. Adam was *sinless* both in act and principle.
 - 2. He possessed the *faculty* of knowledge, and also
 - 3. Holiness and righteousness, which express not only sinlessness, but positive and active virtues. (Pp. 285–288.)
 - 4. Our author shows elsewhere that holiness and righteousness were the effects of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, which God gave to Adam in the day of creation. (Pp. 328, 375, 608.)

3. *Objection* to the *creation* of man in the moral image of God, by Dr. Taylor, answered.

(1.) The fallacy of the objection lies in confounding *habits* of holiness with the *principle*.

(2.) Answer quoted from Wesley.

(3.) From Edwards.

4. *Final* cause of the creation of man — the display of the glory of God, and principally of his moral perfections. (Pp. 288-292.)

II. THE FALL OF MAN.

The Mosaic account,—the garden—serpent, etc.,—teaches of, (1) the existence of an evil spirit; (2) the introduction of a state of moral corruptness into human nature; and (3) a vicarious atonement for sin. There are three classes of opinions held among the interpreters of this account.

(1.) *Class.* Those which *deny the literal sense*, and regard the whole narration as an instructive *mythos*.

(A.) Two *facts* sufficiently refute these notions.

1. The account of the fall of the first pair is a *part of a continuous history*. If, then, the account of the *fall* may be excerpted as allegorical, any subsequent portion of the Pentateuch may in like manner be taken away.

2. The *literal sense* of the history is referred to, and reasoned upon, *as such*, in various parts of Scripture. (Pp. 292-299.)

(B.) *Objections* have been started to the literal and historical interpretation, of which the following are specimens :—

1. "It is unreasonable to suppose that the fruit of the *tree of life* could confer immortality. But

- (1.) Why could not this tree be the *appointed* means of preserving health and life?

- (2.) Why may not the eating of the fruit be regarded as a sacramental act?

2. "How could the fruit of the *tree of knowledge* have any effect upon the intellectual powers?"

1. Surely the tree might be called "the tree of knowledge of good and evil," because, by eating of its fruit, man came to know, by sad experience, the value of the good he had forfeited, etc.—or,

2. It was the *test* of Adam's fidelity, and hence the name was proper.

3. Objection has been made to the account of the *serpent*, (a.) That it makes "the invisible tempter assume the body of an animal." Who can prove this to be impossible? (b.) "But the serpent spoke!" So did Balaam's ass. (c.) "But Eve was not surprised." Why should she? or if she were, the history need not mention so slight a matter. (d.) "But the serpent was unjustly sentenced, if merely an instrument." The serpent certainly held its rank at the pleasure of the Creator. (Pp. 299-303.)

(C.) *Tradition* comes in to support the literal sense of the history.

1. The ancient Jewish writers, Apocrypha, etc.
2. The various systems of heathen mythology—Greek, Egyptian, Mexican, Roman, Gothic, and Hindoo. (Pp. 303–307.)

(II.) *Class.* Those who interpret the account, *in part literally, and in part allegorically*. Sufficiently answered by quotation from Bishop Horsley. (Pp. 307–308.)

(III.) *Class.* Those who believe that the history has, in perfect accordance with the literal interpretation, a mystical and higher sense than the letter. This sentiment, without running into the extravagances of mysticism, is the orthodox doctrine. The *history* is before us:—but rightly to understand it, these four points should be kept in view:—

1. *Man was in a state of trial.*

(1.) This involved power of *obedience and disobedience*.

(2.) That which determines to the one or the other, is the *will*.

(3.) Our first parents were subject to temptation from *intellectual pride*, from *sense*, and from *passion*.

(4.) To resist such temptation, prayer, vigilance, etc., were requisite.

2. *The prohibition of a certain fruit was but one part of the law under which man was placed.*

(1.) Distinction between *positive* and *moral* precepts.

- (2.) The *moral reason* for this positive precept, as indeed for, probably, all others, may be easily discovered.
3. *The serpent was but the instrument of the real tempter*, who was that evil spirit, whose Scriptural appellatives are the *Devil* and *Satan*.
Existence and power of this spirit clearly declared in Scripture.
4. The curse of the serpent was symbolical of the punishment of Satan. This symbolical interpretation defended by three considerations. (Pp. 308–325.)

III. RESULTS OF THE FALL.

- (I.) To Adam, the penalty of “the *offence*,” inevitable *death*, after a temporary life of severe labour.
1. Statement of opinions as to the extent and application of this penalty.
- (a.) Pelagian notion—Adam would have died had he not sinned.
- (b.) Pseudo-Arminian doctrine of Whitby, and others.
- (c.) Arminius’s doctrine, taken from his writings. With this nearly agree the Remonstrants, the Augsburg Confession, the Church of England, and the French and Scottish churches. (Pp. 325–332.)
2. Import of the term *death*, as used in Scripture.
- (a.) “Death came into the world by sin.”
- (b.) It does not imply annihilation.
- (c.) It extends to the *soul* as well as to the

body, thus embracing (1.) Bodily death, i.e., the separation of the soul from the body. (2.) Spiritual death, i.e., the separation of the soul from God. (3.) Eternal death, i.e., separation from God, and a positive infliction of his wrath in a future state.

Taylor's objection answered by Wesley and Edwards. (Pp. 332-337.)

(11.) This sentence extended to Adam's *posterity*.

1. The testimony of Scripture explicitly establishes a *federal connection* between Adam and his descendants. Rom. v. 12-21; 1 Cor. xv. 22.

2. The *imputation of Adam's sin* to his posterity, is the result of this connection. Not *mediate*—not *immediate*—but the *legal result* of sin.

3. The *consequences* of this imputation are, 1.) Death of the body. 2.) Spiritual death. 3.) Eternal death.

4. *Objections* are raised against this doctrine—of two kinds: — one against *high Calvinism*, which we leave to take care of itself; and the other, against the *legal* part of this transaction, without considering, in connection with it, the evangelical scheme. The case may be considered

(1.) With regard to *adults*. The remedial scheme offers, a.) In opposition to *bodily death*—the *resurrection*. b.) In opposition to *spiritual death*—spiritual life. c.) In opposition to *eternal death*—eternal life.

(2.) With regard to *infants*. a.) The benefits of Christ's death are coextensive with the

sin of Adam, Rom. v. 18 ; hence all children dying in infancy, partake of the *free gift*. b.) Infants are not indeed born justified : nor are they capable of that voluntary acceptance of the benefits of the free gift which is necessary in the case of adults :—but, on the other hand, they cannot *reject* it,—and it is by the rejection of it that adults perish. c.) The *process* by which grace is communicated to infants is not revealed : the administration doubtless differs from that employed toward adults. d.) Certain *instrumental* causes may be considered in the case of children,—the intercession of Christ ; ordinances of the church ; prayers of parents, etc. (Pp. 337–349.)

(III.) *The moral condition in which men are actually born into the world.*

I. Several facts of *experience* are to be accounted for.

1. That in all ages great and general *national* wickedness has prevailed.
2. The *strength of the tendency* to this wickedness, marked by two circumstances : 1.) The greatness of the crimes to which men have abandoned themselves. 2.) The number of restraints against which this tide of evil has urged its course.
3. The *seeds* of the vices may be *discovered in children* in their earliest years.

Every man is conscious of a natural tendency to many evils.

5. The passions, appetites, and inclinations, make strong resistance, when man determines to renounce his evil courses. (Pp. 349-356.)

II. To account for these facts, we derive *from Scripture* the hypothesis,—*that man is by nature totally corrupt and degenerate, and of himself incapable of any good thing.* The following passages contain this doctrine,—1.) Gen. v. 3, “Adam begat a son in his own likeness.” 2.) Gen. vi. 5, “Every imagination,” etc. 3.) Gen. viii. 21, “The imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth.” 4.) Book of Job xi. 12; v. 7; xiv. 47; xv. 14. 5.) Psalm li. 5; lviii. 3, 4. 6.) Prov. xxii. 15; xxix. 15. 7.) Rom. iii. 10, quoted from Psalm xiv. 2, 3. 8.) That class of passages which speak of *evil* as a distinguishing mark not of any one man, but of *human nature*, Jeremiah, xvii. 5, 9, etc. 9.) Our Lord’s discourse with Nicodemus, John iii. 10.) Argument in the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

The doctrine of the *natural and universal corruption* of man’s nature, thus obtained from Scripture, fully accounts for the above mentioned five facts of experience. (Pp. 356-366.) Let us see how far they can be explained on

III. The theory of man’s *natural innocence and purity.* This doctrine refers these phenomena to

1. General bad example. But 1.) This does not account for the *introduction* of wicked-

ness. 2. How could bad example become *general*, if men are generally disposed to *good*? 3.) This very hypothesis admits the *power* of *evil example*, which is almost giving up the matter in dispute. 4.) This theory does not account for the *strong bias* to evil in men; nor of the vicious tempers of children, nor for the *difficulty* of virtue.

The advocates of this doctrine refer also to

2. Vicious education, to account for these phenomena. But 1.) Where did Cain get his vicious education? 2. Why should education be *generally* bad, unless men are *predisposed* to evil? 3.) But, in fact, education in all countries has in some degree *opposed* vice. 4. As for the other facts, education is placed upon the same ground as example. (Pp. 367-371.)

IV. *Some take a milder view of the case than the orthodox, denying these tendencies to various excesses to be sinful, until they are approved by the will. But why this universal compliance of the will with what is known to be evil, unless there be naturally a corrupt state of the mind, which is what we contend for. The death of children proves that all men are "constituted" and treated as "sinners."* (Pp. 371-372.)

V. *Nature of original sin.*

1. The forfeiture of the Holy Spirit and consequent privation of the image of God, according to Arminius.

2. No *infusion of evil* into the nature of man by God, but positive evil, as the *effect*, is connected with the privation of the life of God, as the *cause*.
3. As to the *transmission* of this corrupt nature, the Scriptural doctrine seems to be that the soul is *ex traduce*, and not by immediate creation from God. This doctrine does not necessarily tend to materialism.
4. All are born under the curse of the law, which has deprived human nature of the Spirit of God, which can only be restored by Christ.
5. It does not follow from the corruption of human nature that there can be nothing virtuous among men before regeneration. But all that is good in its *principle* is due to the Holy Spirit, whose influences are afforded to all, in consequence of the atonement offered for all. The following reasons may be assigned for the apparent virtues that are noticed among unregenerate men. 1.) The understanding of man cannot reject demonstrated truth. 2.) The interests of men are often connected with right and wrong. 3.) The seeds of sin need exciting circumstances for their full development. 4.) All sins cannot show themselves in all men. 5.) Some men are more powerfully bent to one vice ; some to another.

But all *virtues grounded on principle*, wherever seen

among men, are to be ascribed to the Holy Spirit, which has been vouchsafed to "*the world*," through the atonement. (Pp. 372-384.) See also *Payne*, and *Wardlaw*, on Original Sin.

(B.) REDEMPTION. (Ch. xix-xxix.)

(I.) PRINCIPLES OF REDEMPTION. (Ch. xix-xxii.)

I. *Principles of God's moral government.* (Ch. xix. vol. II.)

The penalty of death was not immediately executed in all its extent upon the first sinning pair. *Why was it not?* In order to answer this question, the character of God, and the principles of his moral government, will be briefly examined.

(I.) The divine character is illustrated by the extent and severity of the punishments denounced against transgression. (Pp. 385-387.)

(II.) It is more fully illustrated by the testimony of God himself in the Scriptures, where

1. The *divine holiness*, and
2. The *divine justice*, are abundantly declared. Justice is either, 1) universal, or 2) particular, which latter is *commutative* (respecting equals) or *distributive*, which is exercised only by governors. Of the strictness and severity of the distributive justice of God, the sentence of death is sufficient evidence. (Pp. 387-389.)

(III.) Connection between the essential justice of God, and *such* a constitution of law and government.

1. The creation of free human beings involved the possibility of evil volitions and acts, and consequently misery.
2. To prevent these evils was the end of the *divine government*, the first act of which was the publication of the will or *law* of God : the second, to give motives to obedience, happiness, justice, fear,
3. It was *necessary* to secure obedience, that the highest penalty should be affixed to transgression.
4. Admitting its *necessity*, its institution was demanded by 1.) The holiness ; 2.) The justice ; and 3.) The goodness of God. (Pp. 389-394.)

(IV.) Does the justice of God *oblige* him to execute the penalty? The opponents of the doctrine of atonement deny this :—but we can show, that

1. *Sin cannot be forgiven by the mere prerogative of God* : for
 - (1.) God cannot give up his right to *obedience*, without indifference to moral rectitude.
 - (2.) Nor can the Deity give up his right to *punish disobedience*, without either (a) *partiality*, if pardon be granted to a *few*; or (b) the abrogation, in effect, of law, if pardon be extended to *all*. (Pp. 394-397.)

2. *Nor does* REPENTANCE, *on the part of the offender*, place him in a new relation, and thus render him a fit object of pardon. Those who hold this doctrine, admit the necessity of *something* which shall make it *right* as well as *merciful* for God to forgive. But we deny repentance to be that something: for

- (1.) We find no intimation in Scripture that the penalty of the law is not to be executed in case of repentance.
- (2.) It is not true that repentance changes the legal relation of the guilty to God, whom they have offended. They are offenders still, though penitent.
- (3.) So far from repentance producing this change of relation, we have proofs to the contrary, both from the Scriptures and the established course of providence.
- (4.) The true nature of repentance, as stated in the Scriptures, is overlooked by those who hold this doctrine.
- (5.) In the *gospel*, which professedly lays down the means by which men are to obtain the pardon of their sins, that pardon is not connected with mere repentance. (Pp. 397-404.)

I. *Death of Christ propitiatory.* (Chap. xx. vol. II.)

In this and the two following chapters, we investigate that method of love, wisdom, and justice, by which a merciful God justifies the ungodly on their believing in Christ; *first*, examining the

statements of the *New Testament*: *secondly*, the sacrifices of the *law*; and *thirdly*, the *patriarchal* sacrifices:—from which investigation we hope to show clearly the unity of the three great dispensations of religion to man, the *Patriarchal*, *Levitical*, and *Christian*, in the great principle, that “without shedding of blood is no remission.” Heb. ix. 22. And first,

A. Proof from the *New Testament*.

I. Man’s salvation is ascribed in the New Testament to the *death of Christ*; and

1. The *Socinian* considers the death of Christ merely as the *means by which* repentance is produced in the heart of man.
2. The *Arian* connects with it that kind of *merit* which arises from a generous and benevolent self-devotion. (Pp. 405-407.) But

II. The New Testament represents the death of Christ as *necessary* to salvation; not as the meritorious *means*, but as the meritorious *cause*.

1. The necessity of Christ’s death follows the admission of his *divinity*.
2. The matter is put beyond question, by the direct testimony of Scripture; “thus it *behooved* Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead.” Luke xxiv. 46.
3. The death of Christ is exhibited as the only hope of the guilty. (Pp. 407-410.)

III. The New Testament informs us that Christ died “*for us*,” that is, in our room and stead.

1. All those passages in which Christ is said to

have died "*for*" (*ὑπὲρ* or *ἀντὶ*) men, prove that he died for us not *consequentially* but *directly*, as a *substitute*.

2. Those passages in which he is said to have "*borne the punishment due to our offences*," prove the same thing.

Grotius and Stillingfleet clearly prove that the Scriptures represent our sins as the *impulsive* cause of the death of Christ.

3. The passage in Isaiah liii. 5, "the chastisement of our peace was upon him," etc., is applied to Christ by the apostles.
4. The apostles represent the death of Christ as penal. 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13. (Pp. 410-419.)

IV. Some passages of the New Testament connect, with the death of Christ, the words *propitiation*, *atonement*, and *reconciliation*.

1. *Propitiation*, occurs in Rom. iii. 25; 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10.

(1.) Definition—to propitiate is to *atone*, to turn away the wrath of an offended person.

(2.) The Socinians, in their improved version, admit that it was "the pacifying of an offended party:" but insist that Christ is a propitiation, because "by his gospel he brings sinners to repentance, and thus averts the divine displeasure." On this ground, *Moses* was a propitiation also.

(3.) Socinians also deny the existence of *wrath* in God:—in order to show that propitiation, in a *proper* sense, cannot be

taught in the Scriptures. But the Scriptures abundantly assert that "*God is angry with the wicked.*"

In holding this Scriptural doctrine, we do not assert the existence of wrath as a *vengeful passion* in the divine mind,—this is one of the many caricatures of orthodoxy by Socinianism. (Pp. 419–425.)

2. *Reconciliation*, occurs in Col i. 19, 22; Rom. v. 10, 11 margin; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

(1.) The expressions "*reconciliation*," "*atonement*," Rom. v. 11, "*making peace*," imply a previous state of *mutual* hostility between God and man. Ephes. ii. 14–17. This relation is a legal one, as that of sovereign and criminal. The term *enmity*, used as it respects God, is unfortunate, but certainly something more is implied in reconciliation than man's laying aside his enmity to God.

(2.) Various passages of Scripture go directly to prove this. Rom. v. 11; 2 Cor. v. 19; Eph. ii. 16.

(3.) Socinian objection to the doctrine of reconciliation answered. (Pp. 425–432.)

V. Some texts speak of *redemption* in connection with the death of Christ, e.g., Rom. iii. 24 Gal. iii. 13; Eph. i. 7; 1 Peter i. 18, 19; 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.

(1.) The Socinian notion of a gratuitous deliverance is refuted by the very terms used in

the above cited passages: such as *λυτροω* to redeem, etc.

- (2.) The means by which it has been attempted to evade the force of these statements must be refuted. They are

“That the term redemption is sometimes used for simple deliverance, when no price is supposed to be given.” Answer,

a. The occasional use of the term in an improper manner, cannot be urged against its strict signification.

b. Our redemption by Christ is emphatically spoken of in connection with the *λυτρον* or redemption *price*: but this word is never added to the deliverance effected for the Israelites by Moses.

“That our interpretation of these passages would involve the absurdity of paying a price to Satan.” Answer,

a. The idea of redemption is not to be confined to the purchasing of a captive.

b. Nor does it follow, even in that case, that the price must be paid to him who detains the captive. Our captivity to Satan is judicial, and satisfaction is to be made, not to the jailer, but to him whose *law* has been violated. (Pp. 433-438.)

- (3.) “That our doctrine is inconsistent with the freeness of the grace of God in the forgiveness of sins.” Answer,

- a. Dr. Priestley, himself, in requiring penitence from the sinner, admits that grace may be free, while not unconditional.
- b. The passage of St. Paul, which Dr. P. quotes, runs thus, "Being justified freely by his grace through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. iii. 24.
- c. When sin is spoken of as a *debt*, freely remitted, it is clear that a metaphor is employed. (Pp. 439-445.)

VI. The nature of the death of Christ is still further explained in the New Testament, by the manner in which it connects our justification with *faith in the blood* of Christ: and both our justification and the death of Christ with the "righteousness of God." Rom. iii. 24-26.

- (a.) Thus the forgiveness of sin is not only an act of *mercy*, but an act of *justice*.
- (b.) The steps of this "demonstration" of the righteousness of God are easily to be traced.
For
 1. The law is by this means established in its *authority* and *perpetuity*.
 2. On any other theory, there is no manifestation of God's hatred of sin, commensurate with the intense holiness of the divine nature.
 3. The person who suffered the penalty of the law for us was the Son of God:—in him divinity and humanity were united:—and thus, as "God spared not his own Son,"

his justice is declared to be inflexible and inviolable.

The Socinians object that "the dignity of a person adds nothing to the estimation of his sufferings." But (1,) the common opinion of mankind in all ages is directly against this : and (2,) the testimony of Scripture is explicit on this point.

4. Though all men are brought, by the death of Christ, into "a salvable state," yet none of them are brought from under the authority of the moral law. (Pp. 445-452.)

VII. "The satisfaction made to divine justice," is a phrase which, though not found in Scripture, is yet of theological value, and deserves to be considered.

(1.) There are two views of satisfaction among those who hold the doctrine of atonement,—

1. That the sufferings and death of Christ are, from the dignity of his nature, regarded as a full equivalent and adequate compensation for the punishment of the personally guilty by death.
2. That Christ made satisfaction for our sins, not because his death is to be considered a full equivalent for the remission of punishment, but because his suffering in our stead maintained the honour of the divine law, and yet gave free scope to the mercy of the law-giver.

Both these are defective, but the first may be

admitted, with some explanations. (Pp. 452-453.)

(II.) Some explanatory observations then are necessary.

1. The term *satisfaction* is taken from the Roman law, and signifies the contentment of an injured party by any thing which he may choose to accept in place of the enforcement of his obligation upon the party offending. As a *just* governor, then, God is satisfied, contented with the atonement offered by the vicarious death of his Son.
2. The effect produced upon the mind of the lawgiver, is not the satisfaction, as the Socinians would say, of a vengeful affection.
3. Nor is the death of Christ to be regarded merely as a wise and fit expedient of government : for this may imply that it was one of many possible expedients, though the best. (Pp. 454-457.)

(III.) The Antinomian perversion of these phrases needs to be refuted.

1. Antinomians connect the satisfaction of Christ with the doctrine of the imputation of his active righteousness to believers : but,
 - 1.) We have no such office ascribed in Scripture to the active righteousness of Christ.
 - 2.) This doctrine of imputation makes Christ's sufferings superfluous.
 - 3.) It leaves man without law, and God without dominion.
 - 4.) This is *not* satisfaction in any good sense

it is merely the performance of all that the law requires by one person substituted for another.

2. The terms *full satisfaction* and *equivalent*, are taken by the Antinomians in the sense of payment of debts by a surety: but we answer, He who pays a debt for another, does not render an equivalent, but gives precisely what the original obligation requires.
3. The Antinomian view makes the justification of men a matter of *right*, not of *grace*. On their view, we cannot answer the Socinian objection that satisfaction destroys the free nature of an act of forgiveness. (Pp. 457-461.)

VIII. It is sometimes said that we do not know the *vinculum* between the sufferings of Christ and the pardon of sin. But Scripture seems to give definite information on this point, in declaring the death of Christ to be a "demonstration of the righteousness of God." (Pp. 461-463.)

IX. Objection is made to the *justice* of the substitution of the innocent for the guilty. But

1. It has always been considered a virtue to suffer for others under certain circumstances: and the justice of such acts has never been questioned. Still,
2. It is wrong to illustrate this doctrine by analogies between the sufferings of Christ and the sufferings of persons on account of the sins of others. And,
3. The principle of vicarious punishment could

not justly be adopted by *human* governments in any case whatever. But,

4. In regard to the sufferings of Christ,—the circumstances, (1) of the *willingness* of the substitute to submit to the penalty, and (2) his *right* thus to dispose of himself, fully clear up the question of justice.

The difficulty of reconciling the sufferings of Christ with the divine justice lies rather with the Socinians than with us. The passage, in Ezek. xviii. 20, is satisfactorily explained by Grotius. (Pp. 463–468.)

B. Proof from the *sacrifices of the law*. (Ch. xxi. vol. II.)

Having adduced, from the New Testament, cogent proofs of the vicarious efficacy of Christ's death, as the grand universal sin-offering for the whole world, we proceed, by the light of the argument already made good, to examine the use made of the sacrificial terms of the Old Testament: and first, the *sacrifices of the law*.

The terms taken from the Jewish sacrifices—such as “Lamb of God,” “Passover,” etc.,—when used by the writers of the New Testament would be not only *absurd*, but criminally *misleading* both to Jews and Gentiles: unless intended to teach the sacrificial character of the death of Christ. (Pp. 469–472.)

It is necessary to establish the *expiatory nature of the Jewish sacrifices*, and their *typical character*, both of which have been questioned. To prove that

- I. *The Levitical sacrifices were expiatory*, it is only necessary to show that the *eminent* sacrifices were such.

The notion that these sacrifices were mere mulcts or fines is disproved

1. By the *general* appointment of the blood to be an atonement for the souls. Levit. xvii. 10, 11.
2. By *particular* instances ; e.g., Levit. v. 15, 16. (Pp. 472-477.)
3. By the fact, that atonement was required by the law to be made, by sin-offerings, and burnt-offerings, for even bodily distempers and disorders.
4. By the sacrifices offered statedly for the whole congregation.
5. By the sacrifice of the passover. (Pp. 477-482.)

II. *The Levitical sacrifices were also types.*

A type is a sign or example, prepared and designed by God to prefigure some future thing. St. Paul shows that the Levitical sacrifices were such.

1. In his general description of the typical character of the "church in the wilderness."
2. In his notice of the Levitical sacrifices in particular.
3. The ninth chapter of Hebrews gives direct declarations of the appointment and designation of the tabernacle service to be a shadow of good things to come. (Pp. 483-487.)

III. *Sacrificial allusions* are employed in the New Testament to describe the nature and effect of the death of Christ, not *figuratively*, but properly.

(a.) Illustrated in various passages : 1. For he hath "made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." 2 Cor. v. 21, 22. "Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us." Ephes. v. 2, etc. 3. The whole argument of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews. 4. "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood." Heb. ix. 22. (Pp. 487-493.)

(b.) Illustrated by distinction between *figurative* and *analogical* language.

Quotation from Veysies' Bampton Lectures. (Pp. 493-497.)

IV. As to the objection, that the Jewish sacrifices had no reference to the expiation of moral transgression, we observe,

1. That a distinction is to be made between sacrifices as a part of the theo-political law of the Jews, and sacrifice as a rite practised by their fathers.
2. Atonement was ordered to be made for sins committed against *any* divine commandment.
3. But if all the sin-offerings of the Levitical institute had respected legal atonement and ceremonial purification, those circumstances would not invalidate the true sacrifice of Christ. (Pp. 497, 498.)

C. From the *patriarchal sacrifices*. (Ch. xxii. vol. II.)

Having shown that the sacrifices of the *law* were expiatory, we proceed now to show the same of the *Ante-Mosaic* sacrifices. The proofs are,

- I. The distribution of beasts into clean and unclean.
- II. The prohibition of blood for food.
- III. The sacrifices of the patriarchs were those of animal victims, and their use was to avert the displeasure of God from sinning men: *e.g.*, those of Job, Noah, and Abel. But as that of Abel has given rise to controversy, we shall consider it more at large. (Pp. 499—502.)

IV. *Abel's sacrifice*.

1. As to the matter of it,—it was an *animal* offering: not merely the wool and milk, as Grotius and Le Clerc would have it, but the “firstlings of his flock.”
- 2 This animal offering was indicative of Abel's faith, as declared by the apostle, Hebrews chap. xi. 4.
3. But Davison, in his “Inquiry,” asserts that the divine testimony was not to the “*specific form* of Abel's oblation, but to his *actual righteousness*.”

The objections to this view of the matter are many:

- (1.) It leaves out, entirely, all consideration of the difference between the sacrifice of Abel and that of Cain.
- (2.) It passes over Abel's “faith,” as evinced in this transaction.

- (3.) The apostle is not speaking of the general tendency of faith to induce a holy life, but of faith as producing certain *acts*: and his reference is to Abel's faith, as expressing itself by his offering "a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous."
- (4.) St. John's *incidental* allusion to Abel's personal righteousness does not in the least affect the statement of Paul, who treated professedly, not incidentally, the subject. 1 John iii. 12. And Gen. iv. 7, may be considered in two views: either *a*) to "*do well*" may mean, to do as Abel had done; or, *b*) the words may be considered as a declaration of the principles of God's righteous government over men. (Pp. 502—509.)
4. If then Abel's *faith* had an immediate connection with his sacrifice, the question occurs, to *what* had that faith respect? Let us illustrate the object of the faith of the elders, from Heb. xi. 1-28, and then ascertain the object of Abel's faith also, from the *acts* in which it embodied itself. In this chapter, then,
- (1.) Faith is taken in the sense of *affiance* in God: and supposes some promise or revelation on his part, as the warrant for every act of *affiance*; as in the cases of Enoch, Noah, Abraham, etc.
- (2.) This revelation was antecedent to the faith: but the *acts* and the *revelation* had a

natural and striking conformity to each other: *e.g.*, Noah, etc. Our inference then, as to Abel's sacrifice, is, that it was not eucharistic merely, but an act of faith, having respect to a previous and *appropriate* revelation. The conclusion embodied in the words of Archbishop Magee is warranted by the argument.

(3.) But it may be asked what evidence have we from Scripture that such an antecedent revelation was made? (Pp. 509-514.) We have

(a.) The necessary inferences from the circumstances of the transaction, which, combined with the apostle's interpretation of them, enable us sufficiently to defend this ground. The *text* which may be wanting in the *Old Testament*, is often supplied by the inspired comment in the *New*:—*e.g.*, the *manna*—the *rock*, etc. . . . If it be argued that such types were not understood, as *such*, by the persons among whom they were first instituted, the answer is: 1. Either they were in some degree revealed to such as prayed for light, or we must conclude that the whole system of types was without edification to the Jews, and instructive only to us. 2. We have in Heb. xi. 10—16, in the case of Abraham, a direct proof of a distinct revelation, which is nowhere

recorded as such in the Mosaic history,—of “a better—an heavenly country.” (Pp. 514-518.)

- (b.) Besides these inferences, however satisfactory, we *have* an account, though brief, of such revelation. (1.) The brevity of the account in the Mosaic history, is doubtless not without good reason ; and (2.) brief as it is, we can easily collect, from the early part of Genesis, no unimportant information in regard to primitive theology. (3.) It is in regard to the *first promise* that we join issue with Mr. Davison ; believing that his view of it (*Inquiry*, etc.) contains, with some truth much error. (Pp. 519-523.) For, a.) It is assumed, contrary to evidence, that the book of Genesis is a complete history of the religious opinions of the patriarchs ; and he would have the promise interpreted by them so as to convey only a *general* indistinct impression of a Deliverer, and that the doctrines of the divinity, incarnation, etc., of that Deliverer, were not in any way to be apprehended in this promise. Let us see, then, whether the promise, “interpreted by itself,” must not have led the patriarchs many steps at least towards these doctrines. (b.) The *divine nature* of the promised Redeemer, we are told, was a separate revelation. But surely, the work assigned to him—the blessings he was to procure—the power that he

was to exercise, according to the promise, were all indications of a nature superior to humanity, and to the angels. c.) The doctrine of the *incarnation* was contained also in the promise : This Restorer was to be of “the *seed of the woman*.” d.) So of the doctrine of *vicarious sufferings* : “the heel of the seed of the woman was to be *bruised*,” etc. (Pp. 523–529.)

(4.) It is urged by Mr. Davison, that the faith spoken of in Hebrews xi., had for its simple object, that “God is the rewarder of such as diligently seek him.” But,

a.) Though this is supposed as the ground-work of every act of faith, yet the special acts recorded have each their special object : and,

b.) This notion could not be at all apposite to the purpose for which this recital of the faith of the elders was addressed to the Hebrews. Two views may be given of this recital :—1. That the apostle adduced the ancient worthies as examples of a steady faith in all that God had then revealed to man, and its happy consequences : 2. That he brought them up to prove that all the “elders” had faith in the Christ to come. Nor is this stronger view difficult to be made out, as we may trace in the cases of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc., a respect

more or less immediate, to the leading object of all faith, the Messiah himself.

Enough has been said to prove that the sacrifice of Abel was expiatory, and that it conformed, as an act of faith, to some anterior revelation. (Pp. 530-537.)

V. *A divine origin must be ascribed to sacrifice.*

- I. The evidence of *Scripture* is of sufficient clearness to establish the divine origin of the antediluvian sacrifices : but,
2. The argument drawn from the *natural incongruity* of sacrificial rites ought not to be overlooked : which is strong, even as to the *fruits* of the earth, the offering of which cannot be shown to originate either in reason or in sentiment, and still stronger, as to *animal* oblations. (Pp. 537-546.)

The divine institution of expiatory sacrifice being thus carried up to the first ages, we perceive the unity of the three great dispensations of religion, the PATRIARCHAL, the LEVITICAL, and the CHRISTIAN, in the great principle, "*that without the shedding of blood is no remission.*" (Pp. 547-548.)

(II.) BENEFITS OF THE ATONEMENT.

(Ch. xxiii-xxix.)

A. JUSTIFICATION. (Ch. xxiii. vol. II.)

Preliminary. All natural and spiritual good must be included among the benefits derived to man

from the atonement: but we shall now treat particularly of those which constitute what is called in Scripture, man's SALVATION.

The fruits of the death and intercession of Christ are—

1. To render it consistent with the righteous government of an offended *Sovereign* to *forgive sin* ;
2. To call forth the *active* exercise of the love of God to man, which displays itself
 - (1.) In the variety of the divine dispensations :
 - (2.) In the revelation of the divine will and declaration of God's purposes of grace :
 - (3.) In the institution of the Christian ministry :
 - (4.) In the influences of the Holy Spirit.

The *act* of the merciful *Judge*, by which man is reconciled to God, is called in the Scriptures, JUSTIFICATION. (Pp. 549–554.)

1. Statement of the *Scriptural* doctrine.
 - I. Justification, the remission of sin, the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of righteousness, are phrases of the same import:—of which the following passages are proof: Luke xviii. 13, 14; Acts xiii. 38, 39; Rom. iii. 25, 26; iv. 4, 8.
 2. The importance of maintaining this simple view of justification,—that it *is the remission of sins*,—will appear from the following considerations.
 - (1.) We are taught that pardon of sin is not an act of prerogative, done *above* law: but a judicial process, done *consistently* with law.

- (2.) That justification has respect to *particular individuals*.
- (3.) Justification being a sentence of pardon, the Antinomian notion of *eternal justification* becomes a manifest absurdity.
- (4.) We are guarded, by this view of justification, against the notion that it is *an act of God by which we are made actually just and righteous*.
- (5.) No ground is afforded for the notion that justification imports the *imputation to us of the active and passive righteousness of Christ*, so as to make us both positively and relatively righteous. (Pp. 555-560.)

11. Doctrine of *imputation*.

There are three opinions :

- (1.) The high Calvinistic, or Antinomian scheme, which is, that "Christ's active righteousness is imputed unto us, as ours." In answer to this we say,
 - 1. It is nowhere stated in Scripture.
 - 2. The notion here attached to Christ's *representing* us, is wholly gratuitous.
 - 3. There is no weight in the argument, that "as our sins were accounted his, so his righteousness is accounted ours : " for our sins were never so accounted Christ's, as that he *did* them.
 - 4. The doctrine involves a fiction and impossibility inconsistent with the divine attributes.

5. The acts of Christ were of a loftier character than can be supposed capable of being the acts of mere creatures.
 6. Finally, and fatally, this doctrine shifts the meritorious cause of man's justification from Christ's "obedience unto death," to Christ's active obedience to the precepts of the law. Quotations are made in confirmation from Piscator and Goodwin. (Pp. 560-567.)
- (II.) The opinion of Calvin himself and many of his followers, adopted also by some Arminians. It differs from the first in not separating the active from the passive righteousness of Christ : for such a distinction would have been inconsistent with Calvin's notion that justification is simply the remission of sins. (Pp. 567-570.)
- This view is adopted with certain *modifications* by Arminius and Wesley. (Pp. 570-572.) But there is a manifest difference, which arises from the different senses in which the word *imputation* is used ; the Arminian employing it in the sense of accounting to the believer the benefit of Christ's righteousness ; —the Calvinist, in the sense of reckoning the righteousness of Christ as ours. A slight examination of the following passages will show that this notion has no foundation in Scripture :— Psalm xxxii. 1 ; Jer. xxiii. 6 ; Isa. xlv. 24 ; Rom. iii. 21, 22 ; 1 Cor. i. 30 ; 2 Cor. v. 21 ; Rom. v. 18, 19. In connection with this last text, it is sometimes attempted to be

shown that as Adam's sin is imputed to his posterity, so Christ's obedience is imputed unto those that are saved : (Pp. 573-580 :) : *Goodwin on Justification* : but 1.) The Scriptures nowhere affirm, either the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity or of the righteousness of Christ to those that believe. 2.) To *impute sin*, in Scripture phrase, is to charge the guilt of sin upon a man with a purpose to punish him for it : and 3.) As to the *imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity* ; if by it is meant, simply that the guilt of Adam's sin is charged upon his whole posterity, let it pass : but if the meaning be, that all Adam's posterity are made, by this imputation, *formally* sinners, then the Scriptures do not justify it. (Pp. 580-585.)

(III.) The imputation of *faith* for righteousness.

(a.) *Proof of this doctrine.*

1. It is expressly taught in Scripture, Romans iv. 3-24, etc.,—nor is *faith* used in these passages by metonymy for the object of faith, that is, the righteousness of Christ.
2. The testimony of the church to this doctrine has been uniform from the earliest ages:—Tertullian, Origen, Justin Martyr, etc., down to the sixteenth century. (Pp. 585-592.)

(b.) *Explanation of the terms of the proposition*, that “faith is imputed for righteousness.”

- (1.) *Righteousness*. To be accounted *righteous*, is, in the style of the apostle Paul, to be *justified*, where there has been personal guilt.
- (2.) *Faith*. It is not faith generally considered, that is imputed to us for righteousness, but faith (trust) in an atonement offered by another in our behalf.
- (3.) *Imputation*. The non-imputation of sin to a sinner, is expressly called "the imputation of righteousness without works;" the imputation of righteousness is then the non-punishment or pardon of sin, and by imputing faith for righteousness, the apostle means precisely the same thing. (Pp. 593-596.)
- (c.) The *objections* to the doctrine of the imputation of faith for righteousness admit of easy answer.
- (1.) The Papists err in taking the term "justification" to signify the making men morally just.
- (2.) A second objection is, that if believing is imputed for righteousness, then justification is by works, or by somewhat in ourselves. In this objection, the term "works" is used in an equivocal sense.
- (3.) A third objection is, that this doctrine gives occasion to boasting : but 1.) This objection lies with equal strength against the doctrine of imputed righteousness : 2.)

The faith itself is the gift of God : 3.) The blessings which follow faith are given in respect to the death of Christ : 4.) Paul says that "boasting is excluded by the law of faith." (Pp. 596-597.)

III. *The nature of justifying faith*; and its connection with justification.

1. Faith is 1) assent; 2) confidence :—and this faith is the *condition* to which the promise of God annexes justification.
2. Justification by faith alone is clearly the doctrine of Scripture. Some suppose this doctrine to be a peculiarity of Calvinism, but it has been maintained by various Arminian writers, and by none with more earnestness and vigour, than by Mr. Wesley. (Pp. 597-604.)
3. The general objection to this doctrine is, that it is unfavourable to morality. The proper answer to this *old* objection is, that although we are justified by faith *alone*, the faith by which we are justified is not *alone* in the heart which exercises it : "faith is *sola*, yet not *solitaria*." Some colour is given to this objection by the Calvinistic view of final perseverance, which we disavow.
4. Various errors have arisen from unnecessary attempts to guard this doctrine. (Pp. 605-607.)
 - (1.) The Romish Church confounds justification and sanctification.
 - (2.) Another opinion is, that justifying faith includes works of evangelical obedience.

- (a.) The Scriptures put a plain distinction between faith and works.
- (b.) It is not probable that Christ and his apostles meant more by this word than its fixed and usual import.
- (3.) A third notion, that faith apprehends the merits of Christ, to make up for the deficiency of our imperfect obedience, is sufficiently refuted by the fact that no intimation of it is given in Scripture.
- (4.) The last error referred to is that which represents faith as, *per se*, the necessary root of obedience. Perhaps those who use this language do not generally intend to say all that it conveys. (Pp 607-611.)

IV. A few theories on the subject of justification remain to be stated and examined.

- (1.) The doctrine held by Bishop Taylor, Archbishop Tillotson, and others, that "regeneration is necessary to justification," is an error whose source appears to be two-fold : (a) from a loose notion of the Scriptural doctrine of regeneration : and (b) from confounding the change which repentance implies, with regeneration itself. (Pp. 611-614.)
- (2.) Another theory is that propounded by Bishop Bull, in his *Harmonia Apostolica*, which has taken deep root in the English Church : the doctrine being, that justification is by *works*;—those works being such as proceed from faith, are done by the assistance of the Spirit, and

are not meritorious, but a necessary condition of justification. Instead of reconciling St. James to St. Paul, Bishop Bull takes the unusual course of reconciling St. Paul to St. James: but

- (a.) St. Paul treats the doctrine of justification *professedly*; St. James *incidentally*.
 - (b.) The two apostles are not addressing themselves to persons in the same circumstances, and hence do not engage in the same argument.
 - (c.) St. Paul and St. James do not use the term justification in the same sense. Lastly, the two apostles agree upon the subject of faith and works. (Pp. 614-619.)
- (3.) A third theory is maintained by some of the leading divines of the English Church; which is, that men are justified by faith only, but that faith is mere assent to the truth of the gospel. The error of this scheme consists in the partial view which is taken of the nature of justifying faith.
- (4.) A fourth theory defers justification to the last day. In answer to this, we say,
- a.) It is *not* essential to pardon that all its consequences should be *immediately* removed.
 - b.) Acts of private and personal judgment are in no sense contrary to a *general* judgment.
 - c.) Justification *now*, and at the last day, are not the same:—a.) They are not the same act:—b.) They do not proceed upon the same principle.

- (5.) The last theory is that of collective justification, proposed by Dr. Taylor, of Norwich; which only needs to be stated, not refuted. (Pp. 620-629.)

B. CONCOMITANTS OF JUSTIFICATION.

(Ch. xxiv. vol. iii.)

Adoption and *Regeneration*,* though different from each other, and from justification, they are not to be separated. They occur at the same time and enter into the experience of the same person.

1. *Adoption* is that *act* of the *Father* by which we who were enemies are made the sons of God and heirs of his eternal glory: and is that *state* to which belong freedom from a servile spirit, etc.; with the Spirit of adoption also, or the witness of the Spirit, by which only we can know that the privileges of adoption are ours. The doctrine of the *witness of the Spirit* is clearly taught in the Epistles: it is sometimes called *assurance*, but as this phrase has been abused, it should perhaps be cautiously employed. (Pp. 5-8)

- (1.) There are four opinions on the subject of this testimony of the Spirit.

1. That it is twofold: 1.) A *direct* testimony of the Spirit: 2.) An *indirect* testimony arising from the work of the Spirit in the heart.

* Mr. Watson has fallen into a slight inaccuracy in placing regeneration before adoption. See the note, p. 1. vol. iii.

2. That it is twofold, also : 1.) The fruits of the Spirit in the heart of the believer : 2.) The consciousness, on the part of the believer, of possessing faith.
 3. That there is but one witness, the Holy Spirit, acting concurrently with our own spirits.
 4. That there is a direct witness, which is the special privilege of a few favoured persons. (Pp. 8-10.)
- (2.) Observations on these four opinions.
1. All sober divines allow that Christians may attain comfortable persuasions of the divine favour.
 2. By those who admit justification, it must be admitted that either this act of mercy must be kept secret from man, or, there must be some means of his knowing it : and if the former, there can be no comfortable persuasion, etc., but, on the contrary, Scripture declares that the justified “rejoice.”
 3. If the Christian, then, may know that he is forgiven, how is this knowledge to be attained ? The twofold testimony of the Spirit and the heart declare it. Romans. viii. 16.
 4. But does the Holy Spirit give his testimony *directly* to the mind, or mediately by our own spirits, as Bishop Bull and Mr. Scott affirm ? To the latter doctrine we object, that the witness is still that of our own spirit ; and that but *one* witness is allowed, while St. Paul speaks of *two*.

5. Neither the consciousness of genuine *repentance*, nor that of *faith*, is consciousness of adoption ; and if nothing more be afforded, the *evidence* of forgiveness is only that of mere *inference*.
6. " But are not the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, etc., sufficient proof of our adoption, without a more direct testimony ?" Nay—these very fruits presuppose, not only a pardon, but a *clear persuasion* of that pardon. (Pp. 10–21.)

The witness of the Spirit is *direct*, then, and not *mediate* ; nor is this a new doctrine, as may be easily shown by quotations from *Luther, Hooper, Andrews, Usher, Hooker*, etc. The *second* testimony is that of our own spirits, not to the fact of our adoption *directly*, but to the fact, that we have received the Spirit of adoption, by which we are regenerated, and that we are under no delusive impressions. (Pp. 21–25.)

II. *Regeneration* is that mighty change, wrought in man by the Holy Spirit restored unto him, by which the dominion of sin over him is broken, so that with free choice of will he serves God.

1. Repentance *is* not regeneration, but precedes it.
2. Regeneration is not justification, but always accompanies it : which may be proved
 - (1.) From the nature of justification itself, which takes away the penalty of sin.
 - (2.) From Scripture : " If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature."
3. The regenerate state is also called in Scripture sanctification. (Pp. 1–4.)

DIGRESSION, ON THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT.
(Ch. xxv.—xxviii., Vol. iii.)

The Calvinistic controversy forms a clear case of appeal to the Scriptures, by the light of which we purpose to examine it. In regard to the extent of the atonement,

I. Our proposition is, *that Jesus Christ did so die for all men, as to make salvation attainable by all men,* and we prove it by

1. Passages which expressly declare the doctrine :

(a.) 'Those which say that Christ died "*for all men,*" and speak of his death as an atonement for the sins of the whole world.

(b.) Those which attribute an equal extent to the death of Christ, as to the effects of the fall. (Pp. 26-28.)

2. Passages which necessarily imply the doctrine :

(a.) Those which declare that Christ died, not only for those that are saved, but for those who do or may perish.

(b.) Those which make it the duty of men to believe the gospel ; and place them under guilt, and the penalty of death, for rejecting it.

(c.) Those in which men's failure to obtain salvation is placed to the account of their own opposing wills, and made wholly their own fault. (Pp. 29-31.)

II. We have to consider *what our opponents have to urge against these plain statements of Scripture.* In

the first place, they have *no* text whatever to adduce which declares that Christ *did not* die for the salvation of all, as literally as those which declare that he *did* so die. They merely attempt to explain away the force of the passages we have adduced : thus—

1. To our first class of texts, they object, that the terms, "*all men*," and "*the world*," are sometimes used in Scripture in a limited sense. This may be granted ; but the true question yet remains, whether in the above-cited passages they can be understood, except in the largest sense. We deny this,

(1.) Because the *universal sense* of the terms used, is confirmed either by the context of the passages in which they occur, or by other Scriptures.

(2.) Nor can the phrases "*the world*," etc., be paraphrased as "the world of the elect : " for

a.) The *elect* are in Scripture *distinguished* from the *world*.

b.) The common division of mankind in the New Testament, is into only two parts,—the disciples of Christ, and "the world."

c.) When the redemption is spoken of, it often includes both those who had been chosen out of the world, and those who remained still of the world.

d.) In the general commission, "Go ye into *all* the world," the expression "into" has its fullest latitude of meaning.

- e.) This restrictive interpretation gives gross absurdity to several passages of Scripture. John iii., 16, 17, 18. (Pp. 32-36.)
2. To our second class of texts—those which *imply* the unrestricted extent of Christ's death—certain qualifying answers are given, thus—
- (1.). As to those which speak of Christ having *died for them that perish*.
- a.) "Destroy not him," etc., Romans xiv. 15. Poole's paraphrase on this text, "for whom, in the judgment of charity, we may suppose Christ died," completely counteracts the argument of the apostle. Scott, also, by explaining this as a "caution against doing anything which has a *tendency* to destroy," takes away, completely, the motive on which the admonition is grounded.
- b.) "Denying the Lord that bought them," etc., 2 Pet. ii. 1. The interpretations of Scott and Poole are evasions of the force of the text, which is, that their offence was aggravated, by the fact of Christ's having bought them.
- c.) The case of the apostates, Heb. vi. 4-8, and x. 26-31. Calvinists deny that the apostates referred to were ever true believers or capable of becoming such :—but
1. Paul did not hold out that to the Hebrews as a terror, which he knew to be impossible.
 2. If these apostates never were believers, they could not be admonitory examples.

3. To represent their case as a "falling away"—if it had never been hopeful—was an absurdity of which Paul would not have been guilty.
 4. But what the apostle affirms of their previous state, clearly shows that it had been a state of salvation.
 5. The Calvinistic interpretations are *below* the force of the terms employed; and they are *above* the character of reprobates. (Pp. 37-48.)
- (2.) As to those which make it the duty of men to believe the gospel and threaten them with punishment for not believing,—the Calvinistic reply is, that it is the duty of all men to believe the gospel, whether they are interested in the death of Christ or not; and that they are guilty and deserving of punishment for not believing. (Pp. 48, 49.)—But if Christ died not for all such persons, we think it plain that it cannot be their duty to believe the gospel: and to settle this point, we must determine what is meant by believing the gospel.—The faith which the gospel requires of all, is, "trust in our Lord Jesus Christ:" *true* faith, then, and not merely assent, is implied in believing the gospel. But, of those for whom Christ *did not die*, such faith cannot be required, for,
1. It is impossible.
 2. God could not command what he never intended.

3. What *all* are bound to believe in, is *true*.
(Pp. 50–52.)

(3.) As to the last class of texts,—those which impute the blame and fault of their non-salvation to men themselves, the common reply is, that if men *willed* to come to Christ, they would have life ; but,

1. Put the question to the non-elect ; and either it is possible for them to come to Christ, or it is not ; if the former, then they may come to Christ *without* receiving salvation : if the latter, then the bar to their salvation is not in themselves.

2. The argument from this class of texts is not exhausted :—for they *expressly exclude* God from all participation in the destruction of sinners. “ God willeth all men to be saved,” etc., texts which gave rise to the ancient notion of a secret and revealed will of God, a subterfuge to which, perhaps, few Calvinists in the present day are disposed to resort.
(Pp. 52–56.)

EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT — CONTINUED. (Ch. xxvi., Vol. iii.)

As the Calvinists have no *direct* texts in support of their doctrine, they resort mainly to implication and inference. The words *election*, *calling*, and *foreknowledge*, are much relied upon in their arguments. We shall now proceed to examine the Scriptural meaning of them.

1. ELECTION. Three kinds of election are mentioned in Scripture.

(I.) That of individuals to perform some *special* service ; e.g., Cyrus was elected to rebuild the temple ;—Paul, to be the apostle of the Gentiles. Isaiah xli. 2 ; xlv. 28 ; xlv. 1-4 ; Acts xxvi. 16-18.

(II.) *Collective* election.

(a.) Explanation of its use in Scripture.

1. Of the *Jews*, as the chosen people of God.
2. Of the calling of believers in all nations to be in reality what the Jews had been typically. (Pp. 57-61.)

(b.) Inquiry as to its effect upon the extent of the atonement.

1. With respect to the ancient election of the *Jewish* church,

- (1.) *That* election did not secure the salvation of every Jew individually.
- (2.) *Sufficient* means of salvation were left to the non-elect Gentiles.

(3.) Nay, the election of the Jews was intended for the benefit of the Gentiles,—to restrain idolatry and diffuse spiritual truth.

2. With respect to the election of the *Christian* church,

- (1.) *That* election does not infallibly secure the salvation of the Christian.
- (2.) It concludes nothing against the salvability of those who are not in the church.
- (3.) Christians are thus elected, not in con-

sequence of, or in order to, the exclusion of others, but for the benefit of others as well as themselves. (Pp. 61-63.)

- (c.) *Collective* election is frequently confounded with *personal* election, by Calvinistic commentators, especially in their expositions of

PAUL'S DISCOURSE, Rom. ix. 1-33.

- I. Which we shall examine, *first*, to determine whether *personal* or *collective* election be the subject of it.

- (1.) The exclusion of the Jews is the first topic : the righteousness of which exclusion Paul vindicates against the objections raised in the minds of the Jews,

- a.) By showing that God had limited the covenant to a part of the descendants of Abraham ; (1.) In the case of the descendants of Jacob himself ;—(2.) From Jacob he ascends to Abraham ; v. 7 ;—(3.) The instance of Isaac's children, v. 10-13. On the passage, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated," which has often been perverted, we remark, 1. The apostle is here speaking of "the seed," intended in the promise. 2. This is proved by Gen. xxv. 23, "Two *nations* are in thy womb," etc. 3. Instances of *individual* reprobation would have been impertinent to the apostle's purpose. (Pp. 64-67.)

- b.) By asking the objecting Jews to say whether, in these instances, there was a

failure of God's covenant with Abraham, he expressly denies any unrighteousness in God;—but, those who would interpret these passages as referring to personal, unconditional election and reprobation, are bound to show how he could be *righteous*.

c.) By the statement, “So then, it is not of him that willeth,” etc.:—containing a beautiful allusion to the case of Isaac and Esau.

(2.) The next point of the discourse is, to show that God exercises the prerogative of making *some notorious sinners the special objects of his displeasure*. Here again the example is taken from the Jewish Scriptures; but observe, *it is not Ishmael or Esau*, but Pharaoh, a Gentile, who was a most appropriate example to illustrate the case of the body of the unbelieving Jews, who were, when the apostle wrote, under the sentence of a terrible excision.

(3.) In verse nineteen the Jew is again introduced as an objector: “Why doth he yet find fault?” etc. (Pp. 67–71.)

(a.) This objection and the apostle's reply are usually interpreted as inculcating upon nations visited with penal inflictions, the impropriety of debating the case with God. This interpretation is hardly satisfactory; for,

1. What end is answered by teaching a

hopeless people not to "reply against God?"

2. If this be the meaning, the apostle's allusion to the parable of the prophet, Jer., chap. xviii., is inappropriate; as that parable supposes the time of trial, as to such nations, to be not yet passed.
 3. "Dishonour" is not destruction; no potter makes a vessel on purpose to destroy it.
 4. This interpretation supposes that the body of the Jewish nation had arrived already at a state of dereliction, which is not the case. (Pp. 71-73.)
- (b.) A different view of this part of Paul's discourse is presented. The objection of the Jew goes upon the ground of predestination, which is refuted, not conceded, by the apostle:—as follows,
1. The "vessel" was not made "unto dishonour," until the clay had been "marred:"—i.e., the Jews were not dishonoured, until they had failed to conform with the design of God.
 2. Jeremiah, interpreting the parable, represents the "dishonoured" as within the reach of the divine favour upon repentance.
 3. What follows verse twenty-two, serves still further to silence the objector. The temporal punishment of the Jews in

Judea is alluded to by the apostle, as a proof both of sovereignty and justice ; but that punishment does not preclude the salvability of the race. (Pp. 74-76.)

- (c.) The metaphor of "vessels" is still employed, but by "vessels of dishonour," and "vessels of wrath," the apostle means vessels in *different conditions* ; the *first*, being part of the prophecy which signified the dishonoured state in which the Jews, for *punishment* and *correction*, were placed under captivity in Babylon ; the *second*, with reference to the prophecy in Jeremiah xix. 1-15, had relation to the coming destruction of the temple, city, and polity of the Jews, by the Romans. There could be no complaint of injustice or unrighteousness, in regard to this destruction ; for,
1. It was brought upon themselves by their own sins.
 2. Moreover, these vessels—adapted to destruction by their own sins—were endured with much long-suffering. (Pp. 77-82.) See also *Dr. Morison's Exposition of Romans ix.* 1849.

The x. and xi. chapters of Romans contain nothing but what refers to the *collective rejection* of the Jewish nation, and the *collective election* of all believing Jews and Gentiles into the visible church of God. The discourse then can only be interpreted of collective election ; and we now proceed,

II. To examine it *secondly*, with reference to the question of *unconditional* election, that is, an election of persons to eternal life without respect to their faith or obedience. Such election finds no place in this chapter, though there are several instances of unconditional election,—but we deny that the spiritual blessings of piety spring necessarily from it; or that unbelief and ruin follow in like manner non-election. The discourse abundantly refutes such opinions.

- (1.) The descendants of Abraham in the line of Isaac and Jacob were elected, but true faith and salvation did not follow as infallible consequents. So were the Gentiles at length elected, but obedience and salvation did not necessarily follow.
- (2.) The cases of *non-election* or *rejection* were not infallibly followed by unbelief, disobedience, and punishment: *e.g.*, the Ishmaelites—the Edomites—the rejected Jews in the apostolic age. (Pp. 82–88.)
- (3.) The only argument of any weight, for the ground that *individuals* are intended in this discourse, is, that as none are acknowledged to be the true church but true believers, therefore individual election to eternal life must necessarily be included in the notion of collective election; and that true believers only, under both the old and new dispensations, constituted the “*election* ;” the

"remnant according to the election of grace."

In this argument there is much error.

1. It is a mere assumption, that the spiritual Israelites, in opposition to Israelites by birth, are anywhere called the "election," or the "remnant," etc.
2. It is not true that under the old dispensation, the election of which the apostle speaks was confined to the spiritual seed of Abraham : *e.g.*, case of Esau and Jacob, and their descendants.
3. This notion is often grounded on a mistaken view of verses 6, 7, 8, 9, in this chapter : the view, namely, that in this passage Paul distinguishes between the spiritual Israelites, and those of natural descent ; while the fact is, that he distinguishes between the descendants of Abraham in *a certain line*, and his other descendants.
4. Though we grant that the election of bodies of men to church privileges involves the election of individuals into the true church—still this last, as Scripture plainly testifies, is *not* unconditional, as the former is, but depends upon their repentance and faith.

We have thus shown that the apostle treats of unconditional *collective* election, but not of unconditional individual election. (Pp. 88–98.)

(III.) The *third* kind of election is *personal* election : or the choice of individuals to be the heirs of eternal life.

a.) It is not denied that true believers are styled in Scripture the “elect of God :” but the question arises, What is the import of that act of grace which is termed “an election ?” We find it explained in two clear passages of Scripture ;—to be elected, is to be separated from “the world,” and to be “sanctified by the Spirit, and by the blood of Christ ;” hence, election is not only an act done in *time*, but subsequent to the administration of the means of salvation. John xv. 19 ; 1 Peter i. 2.

b.) The Calvinistic doctrine that God hath from eternity chosen unto salvation a set number of men *unto* faith and final salvation, presents a different aspect, and requires an appeal to the word of God. It has two parts : 1, The choosing of a *determinate number of men* : and 2, that this election is *unconditional*. (Pp. 98–99.)

A. As to the *choosing of a determinate number of men*, it is allowed by Calvinists that they have no express Scriptural evidence for this tenet. And

(1.) As to God’s *eternal* purpose to elect, we know nothing except from revelation, and that declares, (a) that he willeth *all* men to be saved ; (b) that Christ died for *all* men, in order to the salvation of all ; and (c) the

decree of God is, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned:" and if God be unchangeable, this must have been his decree from all eternity: (d) if the fault of men's destruction lies in *themselves*,—as we have proved,—then the number of the elect is capable of *increase* and *diminution*.

- (2.) This doctrine *necessarily* carries with it that of the *unconditional reprobation* of all mankind, except the elect, which cannot be reconciled, (a) with the *love* of God:—(b) with the *wisdom* of God:—(c) with the *grace* of God:—(d) with the *compassion* of God:—(e) with the *justice* of God:—(f) with the *sincerity* of God:—(g) with the Scriptural doctrine that *God is no respecter of persons*:—(h) with the Scriptural doctrine of the *eternal salvation of infants*:—(i) and, finally, with the proper end of *punitive justice*. (Pp. 100-109).

B. We consider now the second branch of this doctrine,—that personal election is *unconditional*.

- (1.) According to this doctrine, the church of God is constituted on the sole principle of the divine purpose, not upon the basis of faith and obedience, which manifestly contradicts the word of God.
- (2.) This doctrine of *election without respect to faith* contradicts the history of the

commencement and first constitution of the church of Christ.

- (3.) There is no such doctrine in Scripture as the election of individuals *unto* faith ; and it is inconsistent with several passages which speak expressly of personal election : *e.g.*, John xv. 19 ; 1 Pet. i. 2 ; 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14. (Pp. 109–114.)
- (4.) There is another class of texts, referring to believers, not individually, but as a body forming the church of Christ, which texts, containing the word “election,” are ingeniously or perversely applied by Calvinists to the support of their doctrine, when in fact they do not contain it. Such is Eph. i. 4, 5, 6. Now in regard to this text, it might be shown, (a) that if personal election *were* contained in it, the choice spoken of, is not of men merely, but of *believing* men ; but, (b) it does not contain the doctrine of personal election, but that of the eternal purpose of God to constitute his visible church no longer upon the ground of descent from Abraham, but on that of *faith in Christ*.
- (5.) Finally, the Calvinistic doctrine has no stronger passage to lean upon. We conclude by asking, if this doctrine be true, (a.) Why are we commanded “to make our *election* sure ?” (b.) Where does Scripture tell us of *elect unbelievers* ? (c.) And

how can the Spirit of truth convince such of sin and danger, when they are, *in fact*, in no danger? (Pp. 114-118.)

II. Having thus considered election, we come now to examine those texts which speak of the *calling* and *predestination* of believers.

- (I.) The words "*call*" and "*calling*" occur frequently in the New Testament. 'The parable in Matthew xxii. 1-14 seems to have given rise to many of these; and a clear interpretation of it will explain the use of the phrase in most other passages. See also *Dr. Morison's Commentary*.
- a.) Three classes of persons are *called* in the parable:—(1.) 'The disobedient persons who made light of the call. (2.) Those embraced in the class of "destitute of the wedding garment." (3.) The approved guests.
- b.) As to the call itself,—(1.) The three classes are on an equality. (2.) No irresistible influence is employed. (3.) They are called into a company, or society, before which the banquet is spread.

These views explain the passages in which the term is used in the epistles; in none of them is the exclusive calling of any set number of men contained. (Pp. 119-122.)

- (II.) The Synod of Dort attempted (p. 122) to *reason* the doctrine from Romans viii. 30. But this passage says nothing of a "*set and determinate number of men*:"—it treats indeed of the privi-

leges and hopes of believers, but not as secured to them by any such decree as the Synod of Dort advocates ; for,

- (1.) The matter would have been out of place in St. Paul's lofty and animating conclusion of his argument on justification by faith.
- (2.) The context relieves the text of the *appearance* of favouring the doctrine.
- (3.) The apostle does indeed speak of the *foreknowledge* of believers, taken distributively and personally, to church privileges, but this strengthens our argument against the use of the passage made by the Synod of Dort ; for 1. Foreknowledge may be simple approval, as in Romans xi. 2 ; and 2. If it be taken in this passage in the sense of simple prescience, it will come to the same issue : for believers, if foreknown at all, in any other sense than *all* men are foreknown, must have been foreknown *as believers*.
- (4.) As to the *predestination* spoken of in the text, the way is now clear : the *foreknown believers* were predestinated, called, justified, and glorified. (Pp. 123-130.)

EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE
SUPPOSED TO LIMIT THE EXTENT OF CHRIST'S
REDEMPTION. (Ch. xxvii. vol. iii.)

1. John vi. 37, "All that the Father giveth to me shall come to me ; and him that cometh to me, I

will in no wise cast out." The Calvinistic view of this text is, that a certain number were "*given*" to Christ; and as none others can *come* to him, the doctrine of distinguishing grace is established.

- (1.) Our first objection to this view is, that Christ placed the reason of the Jews' not coming, in *themselves*, John v. 28, 40, 44, 46.
- (2.) The phrase, "*to be given*" by the Father to Christ, is abundantly explained by the context. (Pp. 131-134.)
2. Matthew xx. 15, 16. The Calvinistic view here is, that God has a right, on the principle of pure sovereignty, to afford grace to some, and to leave others to perish in their sins. The fact that this passage is the conclusion of the parable of the vineyard is sufficient refutation of the interpretation.
3. 2 Tim. ii. 19. This text bears no friendly aspect toward Calvinism.
4. John x. 26, "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." It is a sufficient reply to the Calvinistic view of this text, to state that men are called "the sheep of Christ" in regard to their *qualities* and *acts*, and not with reference to any supposed transaction between the Father and Christ.
5. John xiii. 18. The term "*know*" in this text is evidently used in the sense of discriminating character.
6. John xv. 16. The word "*chosen*" in this text is gratuitously interpreted (by Calvinists) as relating to an *eternal* election; but Christ had "chosen them

out of the world," which must have been done in *time*—when they were in the world.

7. 2 Timothy i. 9, "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling," etc.—No *personal* election spoken of here :—the parallel passage, Eph. iii. 4–6, shows that the apostle was treating of the divine purpose to form the church out of both Jews and Gentiles.
8. Acts xiii. 48, "And as many as were *ordained* to eternal life believed." (Pp. 134–140.)
 - (1.) If the Gentiles, who believed, only did so because they were "ordained" so to do, then the Jews, who believed not, were not guilty, as it is affirmed, of PUTTING THE WORD AWAY from them.
 - (2.) The Calvinistic view carries with it the notion that *all* the elect Gentiles at Antioch believed *at once*, and that no more remained to be converted.
 - (3.) Some Calvinists render the words "*determined*," or "ordered," for eternal life.
 - (4.) In no place in the New Testament where the same word occurs, is it ever employed to convey the meaning of destiny, or predestination. (Pp. 140–142.)
9. Luke x. 20. Our Calvinistic friends forget, in interpreting this text, that names may be "blotted out of the book of life."
10. Prov. xvi. 4. The meaning is, that God renders even those who have made themselves wicked, and remain incorrigibly so, the instruments of glorifying his justice, in their punishment.

11. John xii. 37, 40. Quotations from Isaiah liii. 1 ; vi. 9, 10. In examining these passages, we find,
 - (1.) That they do not affirm that the eyes of the Jews should be blinded by a divine agency, as Mr. Scott and the Calvinists assume. In every view of the passages, the responsible agent is "THIS PEOPLE"—the perverse and obstinate Jews themselves.
 - (2.) A simple prophecy is not a declaration of *purpose* at all ; but the declaration of a future event.
 - (3.) Even admitting the Calvinistic view of the passages, they would afford no proof of *general* election and reprobation, since they have application to the unbelieving part of the Jews only. (Pp. 142-147.)
12. Jude 4. These certain men had been *foretold* in the Scriptures, or their punishment typically predicted. There is nothing here of eternal purpose.
13. 1 Cor. iv. 7, "For who maketh thee to differ from another?" A favourite argument with Calvinists is founded on this text ; and a dilemma raised, on the supposition of gospel offers being made to two men, why one accepts and the other rejects ? They answer that election *alone* solves the question. But
 - (1.) Put the question as to *one* man, at two different periods :—and election will not solve this difficulty : of course, then, it will not solve the other.
 - (2.) The question of the apostle has reference to *gifts* and *endowments*, not to a difference in religious state.
 - (3.) Following out their view, the doctrine would follow that sufficiency of grace is denied to the

wicked, and that their unbelief is not from themselves, which would remove their responsibility.

14. Acts xviii. 9, 10, “. . . for I have much people in this city.” This may mean, either that there were many devout people in the city :—or that there would be many subsequently converted there. (Pp. 147-156.)

THEORIES WHICH LIMIT THE EXTENT OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST. (Ch. xxviii., vol. iii.)

We shall notice in this chapter the doctrines of predestination, etc.

I. *As stated by Calvin himself, and by Calvinistic theologians and churches.*

(I.) *Calvin.*

1. Statement of his opinions from the “Institutes.”
2. His answers to objections shown to be weak and futile, *e.g.*,
 - a.) The objection that the system is *unjust*; which he answers by asserting that it is the will of God—thus making *four* evasions, 1, 2, 3, 4.
 - b.) The objection that if corruption is the *cause* of man’s destruction, the corruption itself was an effect of the divine decree; which he answers by referring again to the sovereign will of God. (Pp. 157-163.)
3. His attempts to reconcile his doctrine with *man’s demerit*, and to relieve it of the charge

of making *God the author of sin*, shown to be feeble and contradictory.

4. His system not reducible to sublapsarianism.
5. His tenets shown to be in opposition to the doctrines of the first ages.
6. Their history from the time of Augustine to Calvin. (Pp. 164–171.)

(II.) *Calvinistic theologians and churches.*

1. Three leading theories prevalent among the reformed churches prior to the Synod of Dort.

a.) *Supralapsarian* :—(1.) *Decree* : to save certain men by grace, and to condemn others by justice. (2.) *Means* : creation of Adam, and ordination of sin. (3.) *Operation* : irresistible grace producing faith and final salvation. (4.) *Result* : that reprobates have no grace, and no capacity of believing and of being saved.

b.) Also *supralapsarian*, but differing somewhat from a.), in this, that it does not lay down the creation or the fall as a mediate cause, foreordained of God for the execution of the decree of reprobation ; but yet Arminius shows that, according to this view, the fall is a *necessary means* for its exercise, and thus God is made the author of sin. (Pp. 171–174.)

c.) *Sublapsarian*, in which man, as the object of predestination, is considered as fallen.

- (1.) Statement of the doctrine. Its basis is, that the whole human race, personally and

individually, are liable to eternal death in consequence of Adam's transgression.
 (2.) Refutation. "The wages of sin is death," but "sin is the transgression of the law."

1. If the race be contemplated as contained *seminally* in Adam, then the whole race would have perished in Adam, without the vouchsafement of mercy to any.
2. If contemplated as to have not only a potential but a real existence, then the doctrine is, that every man of the race is absolutely liable to eternal death for the sin of Adam, to which he was not a consenting party. (Pp. 174-177.)
3. If the foreknowledge of actual transgression be contemplated by the decree, then the actual sins of men are either evitable or necessary,—if the former, then reprobates may be saved : if the latter, none are responsible.
4. It is alleged that Paul represents all men under condemnation to eternal death in consequence of their connection with the first Adam : but,
 - a.) In the gospel "*this* is the condemnation, that men love darkness rather than light :"—hence the previous state of condemnation was not unalterable.
 - b.) In the Scriptures final condemnation is

never placed upon the ground of Adam's offence, but always on *actual sin*.

- c.) The true sense of the apostle in Romans v. is to be obtained from a careful examination of the entire argument :—he is not representing, as Calvinists have it, the condition in which the human race *would* have been, if Christ had not interposed, but its *actual* condition, *both* in consequence of the fall of man and the intervention of Christ. (Pp. 177-184.)

2. *Decisions of the Synod of Dort* : from Scott's translation of the "Judgment of the Synod," etc., read in the great church at Dort, in 1619.

By extracts from Acts i. 4, 5, 6, 10, and 15, it is clear that Dr. Heylin gave a true summary of the eighteen articles on predestination, in the following words :—"That God, by an absolute decree, hath elected to salvation a very small number of men, without any regard to their faith and obedience whatsoever ; and excluded from saving grace all the rest of mankind, and appointed them by the same decree to eternal damnation, without any regard to their infidelity and impenitency." (Pp. 185-192.)

3. *The church of Scotland* expresses its doctrine on these topics in the answers to the 12th and 13th questions of its Larger Catechism ; in which there appears a strict conformity to the doctrines of Calvin.

4. *The church of the Vaudois*, in Piedmont, by the Confession of A.D. 1120, establish the doctrine that Christ died for the salvation of the whole world ; but in the seventeenth century pastors were introduced from Geneva, and the Confession of 1655 embraces the doctrine, and almost the very words, of Calvin on this point.
 5. *The French churches*, in their Confession of 1558, declare Calvinistic sentiments, but the expressions are guarded and careful.
 6. *The Westminster Confession* gives the sentiments of the English Presbyterian churches, and of the Church of Scotland. In chapter iii. the doctrine of predestination is advanced in conformity with the most unmitigated parts of Calvin's Institutes.
 7. *The Seventeenth Article of the Church of England*, and *other Confessions*, are carefully and guardedly expressed. (Pp. 192-196.)
- II. *As held in certain modifications of the Calvinistic scheme.*
- (I.) *Baxterianism*, advanced by Richard Baxter in his treatise of *Universal Redemption*, and in his *Methodus Theologiæ* :—but derived from the writings of Camero, and defended by Amyraut and others.
1. It differs from high Calvinism, as to the doctrine of satisfaction :—as the system explicitly asserts that Christ made satisfaction by his death equally for the sins of every man. Baxter draws many “*absurd consequents* from the

doctrine which denieth universal satisfaction." (Pp. 197-206.)

2. But from an examination of his entire scheme, it amounts only to this,—that although a *conditional satisfaction* has been purchased by Christ for all men, yet Christ has *not* purchased for all men the power of performing the required condition of salvation.—Baxter gives to the elect irresistible effectual grace; but to others, *sufficient grace*, which is called by himself, aptly enough, "*sufficient ineffectual grace*." He admits that all men may have grace to bring them *nearer* Christ; but coming nearer to Christ, and nearer to saving faith, are with him quite distinct. His concern seems to be, to show, not how the non-elect might be saved, but how they might with some plausibility be damned. Quotations from Curcellæus, Dr. Womack, and Maclaine, are in point. (Pp. 206-211.)

- (II.) *Dr. Williams's* scheme is in substance the same as the theory of supralapsarian reprobation. In all other mitigated schemes, the "*sufficiency of grace*" is understood in Baxter's sense. The labour of all these theories, (including those of *Dr. Payne* and *Dr. Wardlaw*,) is to find out some pretext for punishing those that perish, independent of the Scriptural reason, their rejection of a mercy free for all. (P. 212.)

III. *As to their origin.* Those theories seem to have

arisen not from a careful examination of the Scriptures, but from metaphysical subtleties, for by these they have, at all times, been chiefly supported.

(I.) *Eternal decrees.*

1. This term is nowhere employed in the Scriptures; its signification, if it be used at all, must be controlled by Scripture. The decrees of God can only Scripturally signify the determination of his will in his government of the world he has made.
2. These decrees are, in the Scriptures, referred to two classes :—(1) a determination *to do* certain things; and (2) a determination to permit certain things to be done by free and accountable creatures. This last does not involve the consequence of making God the author of sin.
3. That many of the divine decrees are *conditional* we have the testimony of Scripture, which abounds with examples of decrees to which conditions are annexed. We have also instances, as in the case of Eli, of the revocation of the divine decrees. (Pp. 213–223.)

(II.) *The prescience of God.*

1. The Calvinistic *popular* argument is, that as the final condition of every man is foreseen, it must be certain, and therefore inevitable and necessary. The answer is, that certainty and necessity are two perfectly distinct predicaments; as certainty exists in the mind foreseeing, but necessity qualifies the action foreseen.

2. The *scholastic* argument.

- (a.) The Schoolmen distinguished between
 (1.) *Scientia indefinita*—the knowledge of possible things, and (2.) *Scientia visionis*, the knowledge which God has of all real existences :—to which the anti-predestinarians added (3.) *Scientia media*, to express God's knowledge of the actions of free agents, and the divine acts consequent upon them.
- (b.) Absolute predestination is identified with *scientia visionis* by the Calvinists : illustrated by an extract from *Hill's Lectures*. (Pp. 223–230.)

The sophistry of Dr. Hill's statement lies in this, that the determination of the divine will to produce the universe is made to include a determination "to produce the whole series of beings and events that were then future :"—while among the "beings" to be produced were some endowed with free will. If this be denied, then man is not accountable for his personal offences : if allowed, then his (say) sinful acts cannot have been determined in the same manner by the divine will, as the production of the universe and the beings which composed it. (Pp. 230–231.)

(III.) *The human will.*

1. Calvinists find it necessary to the consistency of their theory that the *volitions*, as well as the *acts*, of man should be placed in bondage : and their doctrine, fairly stated, is, that the will is determined to one class of objects, no other

being possible. The Scriptural doctrine is, that, by the grace of God, man, who without that grace would be *morally* incapable of choosing any thing but evil, is endowed with the power of choosing good. (P. 232.)

2. More moderate Calvinists contend that transgressors are responsible for their evil acts, because they are done willingly, although their will could not but choose them. We reply, that this is only the case where the time of trial is past, as in devils and apostates ; and then only because these are personally guilty of having vitiated their own wills : but the case is different as to probationers ; for,

- (1.) It is decided by the word of God, that men who perish might have "chosen life."

- (2.) The natural reason of mankind is in direct opposition to the doctrine. (Pp. 233-236.)

3. The metaphysical doctrine is, that the will is swayed by motives which arise from circumstances beyond the control of man ; but,

- (1.) This still leaves us in the difficulty, that men are bound by a chain of events established by an Almighty power.

- (2.) The doctrine is contradicted by the *language* of men in all countries and ages.

- (3.) We deny the necessary connection between motive and volition : that the mind acts generally under the influence of motives may be granted, but that it is operated upon by them *necessarily*, is contradicted,

(a.) By the fact of our often acting under the *weakest* reason, which is the character of all sins against judgment ; and

(b.) By the fact that we have power to displace one motive by another, and to control those circumstances from which motives flow. (Pp. 237-240.) See also *Dr. Tappan's Treatise on the Will*, p. 340 ; 1860.

(IV.) *The divine sovereignty.*

The Calvinistic doctrine is, that God does what he wills, only because he wills it. But it can be shown from Scripture, that the acts of the divine *will* are under the direction of the divine *wisdom, goodness, and justice.* (Pp. 240-243.)

(V.) The case of *heathen nations* is sometimes referred to by Calvinists as presenting equal difficulties to those urged against election and reprobation. But the cases are not parallel, unless it be granted that the heathen, *as such*, are excluded from heaven.

1. Heathen are bad enough, but the question is not what they are, but what they might be :— they are under the patriarchal dispensation ; and

2. St. Paul affirms that the divine law has not perished from among them, but that if they live up to the light which they possess, they may be saved. (Pp. 244-246.)

(VI.) *Irresistible grace.* We admit that man in his simply *natural* state, is insufficient of himself to think or do any thing of a saving tendency ; and

that when the Holy Spirit is vouchsafed, we are often entirely passive in the first instance ; but we contend that the grace of God has been bestowed upon all men, inasmuch as all are required to do those things which have a saving tendency. These premises

1. Establish the justice of God in the condemnation of men, and
2. Secure the glory of our salvation to the grace of God. (Pp. 246-251.)

C. FURTHER BENEFITS OF REDEMPTION.

(Ch. xxix., Vol. iii.)

- I. *Entire sanctification* of believers.* That there is a distinction between a regenerate state and a state of perfect holiness, is sufficiently proved by the exhortations to believers, in 1 Thess. v. 23, and 2 Cor. vii. 1—"perfecting holiness in the fear of God."
1. The *time* when we are to expect this blessing has been disputed : it is admitted that the soul must be entirely cleansed before it can pass into heaven,

* The terms "entire sanctification" and "perfect holiness" are evidently used by Mr. Watson, as by many others, to designate the same work of grace. The Venerable Hugh Bourne, however, distinguished the one from the other ; and his distinction is not without a difference. The doctrinal statement in the Deed Poll is—"Sanctification by the Holy Spirit, producing inward and outward holiness." Mr. Bourne understood *sanctification* as designating the *state* of mind superinduced by the *restoration* of the Holy Spirit ; while *perfect holiness*, in all the activities of the heart and life, is represented as being *produced* by the sanctification of the Spirit. The passage in 1 Thess. v. 23 does not refer to the entire sanctification of the individual, but to the sanctification of the whole church.

but many contend that the final stroke to corruption can only be given at death :—but

- (1.) The promise of sanctification is nowhere restricted in Scripture to the article of death.
- (2.) The soul's union with the body is nowhere represented as a necessary obstacle to its entire sanctification. Romans vii. has indeed been adduced in proof of this ; but the apostle is giving the experience of one yet under the *law*, and not in a state of deliverance by Christ.
- (3.) This doctrine is disproved by those passages which connect sanctification with the subsequent exhibition of its fruits in life. Rom. vi. 22.
- (4.) It is disproved, also, by all those passages which require us to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit ; for these are required of us in perfection and maturity, and necessarily suppose the entire sanctification of the soul from the opposite and antagonist evils. Eph. v. 9 ; Gal. v. 22.
- (5.) This doctrine involves other antisciptural consequences—that the seat of sin is in the flesh ; and that the flesh must not only lust against the Spirit, but on many occasions be the conqueror. Matt. v. 8 ; Heb. xii. 14.

We conclude, then, that as sanctification can neither be referred to the hour of death nor placed subsequently to this life, it is an attainment to which believers are called during this life. (Pp. 251–258.) See also *Dr. Morison's Exposition of the Third Chapter of Romans* pp. 415–421. 1866.

2. The *manner* of sanctification. It may be (1) gradual, or (2) instantaneous.

3. *Objections* to this doctrine.

(1.) It supposes future impeccability. Nay, the angels sinned, and so did our first parents.

(2.) It renders the atonement and intercession of Christ superfluous. Nay, for this state of sanctification is maintained by the constant influences of the Holy Spirit, vouchsafed through Christ's intercession.

(3.) It shuts out the use of the prayer, "forgive us our trespasses." But, a) this prayer is designed for men in a mixed condition: b) *all* sin must not be continued in order that this prayer may be employed: and c) the defects and infirmities of a being *naturally* imperfect, are not inconsistent with moral holiness. (Pp. 258-260.)

II. *The right to pray* is another benefit which accrues to believers: and so is

III. *The special providence of God.*

IV. *Victory over death* is also awarded to them.

V. *The immediate reception of the soul into a state of blessedness.* "The sacred writers proceed on the supposition that the soul and the body are naturally distinct and separable, and that the soul is susceptible of pain or pleasure during that separation." Quotation from Campbell. (Pp. 260-265.)

VI. *Resurrection of the body.* There is some dispute in regard to this doctrine, whether it implies a re-

surrection of the *substance* of the body, or of a minute and indestructible *germ*.

1. The only passage of Scripture which seems to favour the *germ* theory, is 1 Cor. xv. 35, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" These two questions both imply a doubt as to the fact—not an inquiry as to the *modus agendi*: and the apostle answers them by showing, in answer to the *first* question, that there is nothing incredible in the thing: and in answer to the *second*, that the doctrine of our reunion with the body implies nothing contrary to the hopes of liberation from the "burden of this flesh," because of the glorified qualities which God is able to give to matter.
2. There are several *difficulties* connected with this theory: for on its hypothesis
 - (1.) There is no resurrection of the *body*: for the germ cannot be called the body.
 - (2.) There is no *resurrection* from *death* at all, but a *vegetation* from a secret principle of life.
 - (3.) It is substantially the same with the pagan doctrine of metempsychosis.

An objection to the resurrection of the body has been drawn from the changes of its substance during life. This does not affect the doctrine that the body which is laid in the grave shall be raised up. "But," we are told, "the same bodies that sin may not be punished." We answer, that the soul is the only rewardable *subject*,—the body is its *instrument*. (Pp. 265–274.)

PART THIRD.

MORALS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Outline.

- (I.) The moral law. (Ch. i.)
- (II.) The duties we owe to God. (Ch. ii., iii.)
- (III.) Duties to our neighbour. (Ch. iv.)

(I.) THE MORAL LAW. (Ch. i., Vol. iii.)

Preliminary observations,—

- (1.) The morals of the New Testament are not presented to us in the form of a regular code.
 - (2.)¹ The divine authority of the Old Testament is everywhere presupposed. (Pp. 275-276.)
- I. *The moral laws of the Old Testament pass into the Christian code.*
- 1. The ceremonial law is repealed, being adumbrative and temporary;
 - 2. The political law also; but
 - 3. The moral precepts are *not* repealed; but even incidentally re-enacted, *scil.*, Christ's declaration, "I am not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil;" and Paul's, "Do we then make void the law through faith?" The argument, then, from the want of formal re-enactment, has no weight. See also *Dr. James Morison's* Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, pp. 134-204, 413; 1866.

4. The entire decalogue is brought into the Christian code by a distinct injunction of its separate precepts. (Pp. 276-279.)

II. *These laws, in the Christian code, stand in other and higher circumstances than under the Mosaic dispensation.*

1. They are extended more expressly to the *heart*.
2. They are carried out into a greater variety of duties.
3. There is a more enlarged injunction of positive and particular virtues.
4. All overt acts are connected with corresponding principles.
5. These laws are connected with promises of divine assistance.
6. They have a living illustration in the example of Christ.
7. They are connected with higher sanctions. (Pp. 279-281.)

III. *All attempts to teach morals, independent of Christianity, must be of mischievous tendency.*

1. Because such attempts convey the impression that *reason* alone could discover the duty of man.
2. Because they displace what is *perfect* for what is *imperfect*.
3. Because they turn away from the revealed law to inferior considerations, such as beauty, fitness, etc.
4. Because they either enjoin duties merely outward in the act, or else assume that human nature is able to cleanse itself.

5. Because that by separating *doctrines* from *morals*, they propose a new plan, other than that of the gospel, for renovating and moralizing the world. Yet moral philosophy, if properly guarded, and taken in connection with the whole Christian system, is not to be undervalued. (Pp. 281-284)
- IV. *As to the reasons on which moral precepts rest*, it may be remarked,
 1. Some rest wholly on the authority of a revealer ;
 2. Others are accompanied with manifest rational evidence ;
 3. Others partially disclose their *rationale* to the anxious inquirer. (Pp. 284-285.)
- V. With respect to *the application of general precepts*, wide observation is necessary.
 1. The precepts must be mostly *general*.
 2. *Exceptions* to general rules should be watched with jealousy. (Pp. 285-286.)
- VI. *Grounds of moral obligation*.
 1. "Eternal and necessary fitness of things" leaves the question still open.
 2. "Moral sense," also unsatisfactory ; for
 - (a.) Its indications are neither *perfect* nor *uniform*.
 - (b.) Its mandates have no authority.
 3. "Doctrine of the greatest good,"—circuitous and impossible in practice.
 4. *The will of God*, then, the only true ground of moral obligation. The obligation is founded on the relation of the creature to the Creator. (Pp. 286-288.)

VII. *Nature of moral rectitude.* (Payne's view.)

1. We sustain various relations to God.
2. We sustain various relations to each other.

Virtue is the conformity or harmony of man's affections or actions, with the various relations in which he has been placed: and since these relations were constituted by God, *rectitude* may be regarded as conformity to the moral nature of God, the ultimate standard of virtue. (Pp. 288-291.)

(II.) THE DUTIES WE OWE TO GOD. (Ch. ii., Vol. iii.)

Summed up in Scripture under the word *godliness*, embracing

I. *Internal principles.*

1. Submission to God.

- (a.) Grounded on the obligations (1) of creation,
(2) of redemption.

- (b.) Regulated by his will, which is the highest rule of moral virtue,

- (1) Because of its authority.

- (2) Because it defines and enforces every branch of duty.

- (3) Because it annuls every contrary rule.

- (4) Because, instead of lowering its claims to suit man's weakness, it connects itself with the offer of strength from on high.

- (5) Because it accommodates itself to no man's interests.

- (6) Because it admits no exceptions in obedience. (Pp. 292-293.)

2. Love to God.

- (a) Its nature.
- (b) Its importance in securing obedience. (Pp. 293-296.)

3. Trust in God.

- (a) Grounded on the divine injunction : probable *reason*, to secure our peace of mind.
- (b) Measured by the divine promises of help in the word of God.
- (c) Hence connected with conversion, necessarily. (Pp. 296-298.)

4. Fear of God.

- (a.) Its nature : (1.) Reverential, not servile, yet (2.) Involving a sense of our conditional liability to his displeasure.
- (b.) Its practical influence.

5. Holiness rests upon these moral principles and habits. (Pp. 299-301.)

II. *External duties.*A. *Prayer.*

- (a.) It is *enjoined* in Scripture, Matt. vii. 7 ; Luke xxi. 36 ; Phil. iv. 6 ; 1 Thess. v. 17 ; what it is required to be (1.) Earnest, John iv. 24 ; Rom. xii. 12 ; (2.) Importunate, Luke xi. 1-13 ; 2 Corinthians xii. 8, 9 ; (3.) Offered for particular blessings, Phil. iv. 6 ; Psalm cxxii. 6 ; Zech. x. 1 ; 1 Tim. ii. 1-3, etc.
- (b.) The *reason* on which it rests. We can infer from Scripture,
 - 1. That it cannot of itself produce in man a fitness for the reception of God's mercies.

2. That it is not an *instrument* but a *condition* of grace.
3. But that it preserves in men's minds a sense of God's agency in the world, and of the dependence of all creatures upon him. (Pp. 301-306.)

(c.) *Objections* to this duty.

1. One is founded on predestination.
 - a. Answer on predestinarian principles—insufficient and contradictory.
 - b. True answer, that although God has *absolutely* predetermined some things, there are others which he has *conditionally* predetermined.
2. A second is founded on the perfections of the divine character. Paley's answer.
3. A third is, that it is hard to conceive how prayer can affect the case of others.
 - a. If it were so, that would not affect the duty.
 - b. But it is no harder to conceive than why one man's virtues or vices should affect the condition of others, which is the case every day. (Pp. 307-310.)

(d.) *Division* of prayer. Four branches.

1. Ejaculatory.
 - a. Its nature. b. Its advantages.
2. Private.
 - a. Founded upon Christ's injunction and example.

- b. Designed to produce unlimited confidence in God our Father. (Pp. 311-312.)

3. Family.

- a. Paley's view of it defective.
- b. Its obligation shown, (1.) From the very constitution of a family. (2.) From the fact that the earliest patriarchal worship was family worship, which was not revoked either by Judaism or Christianity.
- c. Its advantages. (Pp. 312-318.)

4. Public.

- a. Its obligation shown. (1.) From the *example* of public worship among the Jews. (2.) By *inference* from the command to publish the gospel, implying assemblies. (3.) By *direct* precepts, *e.g.*, Paul's Epistles are commanded to be read in the churches. (4.) From the practice of the primitive age, shown from St. Paul and St. Clement.
- b. Its advantages. (Pp. 318-320.)

(e.) *Forms* of prayer.

- 1. Worship should be spiritual—which was doubtless the character of that of the primitive church. Latin and Greek corruptions. The liturgies of the reformed churches purified from these corruptions.
- 2. Objections to forms of prayer.
 - a. Absolute. But
 - (1.) This objection involves principles which cannot be acted upon.
 - (2.) It disregards example and antiquity.

Example of the Jews : of John Baptist : of Christ : of the primitive church. (Pp. 320-325.)

- b. It is objected that "forms composed for one age become unfit for another." But
 - (1.) The form may be modified.
 - (2.) In fact, such forms have not become obsolete among us.
 - (3.) If opinions become unscriptural, the form is a safeguard against heresy.
- c. "The repetition of the form produces weariness and inattention." Answer.
 - (1.) The devout will not grow weary.
 - (2.) The undevout will, even if extempore prayers are used.
- d. "Forms must take too *general* a character." Ans.
 - (1.) This is not true of the Liturgy of the Church of England.
 - (2.) If extempore prayer be allowed also, the objection has no weight. (Pp. 325-326.)
- 3. Objections to extempore prayer.
 - a. It gives rise to extravagant addresses to God. Ans. This will only be the case where the preachers are foolish or incompetent.
 - b. It confuses the minds of the hearers. Ans. This lay against the inspired prayers in the Bible when first uttered ; and would

now lie against all occasional forms.
Facts, too, disprove it.

4. Conclusion. That each mode has its advantages, and that their proper combination forms the best public service. (Pp. 327-328.)

B. *Praise and thanksgiving.*

- a. Psalms and hymns to be sung with the voice, and united with the melody of the heart, are of apostolic injunction.
- b. Uses. 1) To acknowledge God ; 2) To promote suitable sentiments of gratitude and dependence in our hearts. (P. 328.)

(Ch. iii., Vol. iii.)

C. *Observance of the Lord's day.*

I. Obligation.

(I.) Though the observance is nowhere enjoined in so many words, yet, on the supposition that the sabbath was instituted at the creation, we derive its obligation with great clearness from the Scriptures.

- a. As to the observance of a sabbath in general.

(1.) *Inferentially*, from the history of its observance from the creation down to the period of the gospel narrative, while no Scripture indicates its abolition.

(2.) *Directly*, since the decalogue is binding on us, proved,

(a.) By our Lord's declaration that

he "came not to destroy the law and the prophets."

(b.) By the text, "The sabbath was made for man."

(c.) By St. Paul's reply, (Rom. iii. 31,) "Do we then make void the law through faith?" (Pp. 329-333.)

b. As to the observance of a particular day.

(1.) The change from the seventh to the first day was made by inspired men.

(2.) This change did not alter the law of the sabbath, which was not so circumstantial as to require uniform modes of reckoning time, and observance of latitudes and longitudes for its fulfilment.

(3.) The original command says nothing of the epoch when the reckoning should begin. Holden.

(4.) But, for the sake of *public worship*, the sabbath should be *uniformly* observed by a whole community at the same time. (Pp. 333-337.)

(II.) But it has been denied that the sabbath *was* instituted at the creation.

a. Paley's ground, as summed up and answered by Holden. His principal ground is, "that the first institution of the sabbath took place during the sojourning of the Jews in the wilderness," and from the passage in Exod. xvi. he infers

1. "That if the sabbath had been instituted at creation, there would be some mention of it in the history of the patriarchal ages." But this history is very brief: there are omissions in it more extraordinary, *e.g.*, prayer and circumcision: the sabbath is hardly mentioned in Joshua, Judges, Ruth, etc; but the observance of it seems to be intimated by the division of time into weeks, in the patriarchal history.
2. "That there is not, in Exod. xvi., any intimation that the sabbath was only the revival of an ancient institution." But the fact is, that it is mentioned exactly in the way an historian would, who had occasion to speak of a well-known institution.
3. Gen., chapter ii., is next adduced by Dr. Paley as not inconsistent with his opinion, as he concurs with those critics who suppose that Moses mentioned the sanctification of the sabbath in that place, by *prolepsis*, in the order of connection, not of time. But this doctrine is altogether gratuitous, and also inconsistent with the design of the sacred historian to give a clear and faithful history.

The law of the sabbath, then, is *universal*, and not peculiar to the Jews. (Pp. 337-345.)

II. Mode of observing the Christian sabbath.

1. There are two extremes : (1.) To regard the sabbath merely as a prudential institution ; (2.) To neglect the distinction between the *moral* and the *ceremonial* law of Moses : but yet,
2. Those precepts of the Levitical code which relate to the sabbath, are of great use to us, though independent of these.
3. We have, throughout the Scriptures, abundant guidance : by which we learn, a.) That the sabbath is to be a day of *rest* and *devotion* : b.) That works of mercy are not unlawful : c.) But that the *management* of public charities is too secular an employment for the sabbath : d.) And that *amusements* and recreations are out of place, nay, sinful. (Pp. 346-350.)

(III.) DUTIES TO OUR NEIGHBOUR.

(Ch. iv., Vol. iii.)

I. Charity, which is to be considered,

1. As to its *source*.

That source is a regenerated state of mind.

2. As to its *exclusiveness*. It shuts out all 1) anger ; 2) implacability ; 3) revenge ; 4) prejudice ; 5) evil speaking ; 6) petty aggressions, though legal ; 7) artificial distinctions, as its limitations.
3. As to its *active expression*.
 - (1.) It delights in sympathy, liberality, etc., as it is not merely negative.

(2.) It dictates and regulates *works of mercy*.

(3.) It teaches us that we are only *stewards* of the divine goodness. (Pp. 351-356.)

II. Justice. (I.) *Ethical* : (II.) *Economical* : (III.) *Political*.

(I.) *Ethical* justice respects

A. Man's *natural* rights, which are,

1. Right to *life* ; which is guarded by the precept, "Thou shalt not kill," etc.

2. Right of *property* ; guarded by the law, "Thou shalt not steal nor covet."

3. Right of *liberty* ; manstealing is classed in the New Testament with the greatest crimes. In noticing the question of slavery, we remark,

a.) That slavery did exist under the Jewish law ; but of a much milder type than that which prevailed in the surrounding nations ; and all that can be inferred from it is, that a legislature may, in certain cases, be justified in mitigating, rather than abolishing, the evil.

b.) Every Christian government binds itself to be regulated by the principles of the New Testament, which are obviously opposed to slavery.

c.) Modern *African slavery* calls loudly for the application of such principles. The slaves have never lost the right to liberty ; and that liberty should be restored. The manner of its restoration is in the

power of government, provided 1. That the emancipation be sincerely determined upon at some future time : 2. That it be not delayed beyond the period which the general *interest of the slaves themselves prescribes* : 3. That all possible means be adopted to render freedom a good to them. (Pp. 357-362.) [Slavery is now and for ever abolished.]

B. The question may be asked whether man himself has the power of surrendering these great natural rights at his own option ?

1. With respect to *life*.

- (1.) Where *duty* calls, (as in case of invasion, or when our allegiance to Christ must otherwise be laid down,) we are not only at liberty to take the risk, but bound to do it.
- (2.) *Suicide* was considered unlawful by the ancients, on the ground of its being a violation of God's appointment : and modern ethical writers have added little to the force of their doctrines on the subject. Of course their views are inefficient. "Thou shalt not kill" is the divine prohibition against killing ourselves, as well as others :—not, "Thou shalt do no murder," as Archbishop Whately incorrectly quotes, and then reasons upon. The crime of murder lies in the fact that man is made in the image of God—immortal. Self-murder is unpardonable.

- (3.) *Duelling* involves the two crimes of murder and suicide.
2. With respect to *property*. Christianity teaches us that property is a *trust*—has its duties as well as its rights—and that gambling, prodigality, etc., are violations of that trust.
 3. *Liberty* cannot be voluntarily parted with under the Christian dispensation. (Pp. 362-371.)
- C. The right of *conscience* is now to be considered.
1. The *duty* of religious worship and opinions, and the *right* to the profession of the latter and practice of the former are strictly correlative; and as the obligation to perform the duty cannot be removed, so neither can the right to its performance be destroyed.
 2. But government has authority to take cognizance of the manner in which this right is exercised, and can interfere (1,) where the worship is vexatious to society in general, or, (2,) the opinions subversive of the principles of social order, or (3,) where dangerous political opinions are connected with religious notions. See also *Dr. John Brown's* "Law of Christ respecting Civil Obedience;" 1842.
 3. The case of those who reject revelation must be considered on its own merits.
- (1.) Simple *Deism* may afford such a plea of conscience as the state ought to admit, though rejected by a sound theologian.

(2.) To *Atheism* no toleration can be extended by a Christian government ;—for, a) jurisprudence cannot coexist with such doctrines : b) they are subversive of the morals of the people : and, c) no conscience can be pleaded by their votaries for the avowal of such tenets. (Pp. 371-375.)

(II.) *Economical justice* respects those relations which grow out of the existence of men in families.

1. Relation of husband and wife, founded on the institution of marriage.

(1.) *Obligation* of marriage. General, but not imperative, on every man, in all circumstances. Exceptions require the justification of an equal or paramount obligation.

(2.) *Ends* of marriage.

(a.) To produce the greatest number of healthy children.

(b.) To fix the relations which give rise to the domestic affections, etc.

(c.) To prevent polygamy, which 1, was forbidden by the original law, although the practice of the Jews may have fallen short of it ; 2, was expressly forbidden by Christ in his discourse with the Pharisees ; 3, is forbidden also by nature.

(d.) To prevent fornication, which it does, 1, by providing for a lawful gratification of the sexual appetite ; 2, by the mutual love which it presupposes in the parties, without which the institution is profaned. (Pp. 375-379.)

(3.) *Character* of the marriage contract.

(a.) It is partly a civil contract—being under the control of the State for weighty reasons.

(b.) It is also a religious act, in which vows are made to God by the contracting parties. Though the Scriptures do not expressly assign its celebration to the ministers of religion, yet the State wisely allows it.

(4.) *Rights and duties* of marriage.

2. Duties of children. Comprehensiveness of the precept, "Honour thy father and thy mother," embracing

(1.) *Love*, comprising esteem and gratitude.

(2.) *Reverence*, comprising, a,) the desire to please, b,) the fear to offend, c,) the external manifestation of these in honour and civility, and, d,) the support of parents when in necessity.

(3.) *Obedience*, which is to be universal, except in cases of conscience. This rule is most severely and frequently tried in regard to marriage. Here

a.) The child is not bound to marry at the command of the parents.

b.) But should not violate their prohibition, except, only, when the parties are of age, and then only if, 1,) the opposition is to a child's marrying a religious person ; or 2,) is capricious ; or 3,) is unreasonable. (Pp. 379-388.)

3. Duties of parents.

- (1.) *Love*, implying
 - (a.) The natural instinct of affection, cultivated by religion.
 - (b.) The care and support of offspring.
- (2.) *Instruction*, which includes
 - (a.) 'The education of children in a way suited to their condition.
 - (b.) Their training in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord"—as the parent is a priest in his own family; and
 - (c.) The affording them a godly example.
- (3.) *Government*, which should be
 - (a.) Mild and gentle,
 - (b.) Firm and faithful, implying even the use of corporeal punishment, when necessary.
- (4.) Provision for the settlement of children in the world is a duty of parents, only limited by their ability. (Pp. 388-392.)
4. Duties of servant and master.
 - (a.) This is a relation which *must* exist, as equality of condition is impossible.
 - (b.) But it is a source of great evil, when unregulated by religion.
 - (c.) The precepts of the New Testament go to prevent this evil, by assigning,
 - (1.) The duties of servants—honour and obedience to be cheerful and from the heart.
 - (2.) The reciprocal duties of servants and masters; involving obedience on the one part, and kindness, moderation, and justice, on the other; and

- (3.) The religious duties of masters, including
 —1. Religious instruction : 2. The observance of the sabbath : 3. Exerting *influence* in favour of religion. (1^p. 392-398.)

(III.) *Political justice.*

1. Origin of power.
 - (a.) The Scriptures declare government to be an “ordinance of God.”
 - (b.) The doctrine of a “social compact” is therefore unscriptural.
 - (c.) Paley’s view, which places the obligation in the will of God as collected from expediency, is too loose ; that will is declared in the Scriptures. (Pp. 398-401.)
2. Rights and duties of sovereign and subject reciprocal.
 - (a.) Duties of government,—enactment of just laws, etc. Obligation grounded on direct passages of Scripture.
 - (b.) Duties of subjects,—obedience, tribute, prayer, etc. (Pp. 401-404.)
3. Question—“How far does it consist with Christian submission to endeavour to remedy the evils of a government ?”
 - (a.) No *form* of government is enjoined in the Scriptures. Hence there is no divine right in particular families.
 - (b.) Resistance to an *established* government, whatever may be its form, is consistent with duty only in certain extreme cases. There are two kinds of resistance :

1. Of opinion. In order to be lawful, this resistance must be, (1) just ; (2) directed against public acts ; (3) practical ; (4) deliberate ; (5) not factious ; (6) not respecting local, but general interests. (Pp. 404-407.)
2. Of force. This may be divided into two kinds—
 - (1.) That of a controlling force in the government ; *e.g.*, the British parliament, which can refuse supplies, etc. This resistance, which is implied by a constitutional State, is lawful, when advisedly and patriotically employed.
 - (2.) That of arms. Three cases may be supposed ;
 - a.) Where the nation enjoys and values good institutions. Here unjust aggressions will not succeed.
 - b.) Where popular opinion is only partly enlightened. Here the work of improvement should precede resistance. Should the despot triumph, patriotism will suffer. Should the reformers triumph, the ignorant mass run on into licentiousness ; *e.g.*, French revolution and parliamentary war.
 - c.) Where the sovereign power acts, by mercenaries, or otherwise, in opposition to the views of the majority. Here resistance is justifiable, *e.g.*, Revolution of 1688.
4. The case of *rival* governments.
5. Resistance for *conscience*' sake. (Pp. 407-413.)

PART FOURTH.

INSTITUTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Outline.

- I. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Ch. i.
- II. THE SACRAMENTS. Ch. ii.-iv.
 - (I.) Number and nature of sacraments, (Ch. ii.)
 - (II.) Sacrament of baptism, (Ch. iii.)
 - (III.) Sacrament of Lord's supper, (Ch. iv.)

I. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

(Ch. i., Vol. iii.)

The church of Christ, in its largest sense, consists of all who have been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ; in a stricter sense, it consists of those who are vitally united to Christ. Taken in either view, it is a visible, permanent society, bound to obey certain rules, and of course *government* is necessarily supposed to exist in it. We have four points to examine in this chapter:—

1. *The nature of this government.* It is wholly spiritual, for
 1. It is concerned only with spiritual objects.
 2. Its only punitive discipline is comprised in “admonition,” “reproof,” “sharp rebukes,” and finally, “excision from the society,” without any infliction of civil pains or penalties. (Pp. 414–417.)

II. *The persons to whom this government is committed.*

It is necessary here to consider the composition of the primitive church, as stated in the New Testament.

1. Enunciation of offices in the church. Eph. iv. 11.

2. Whether the words *bishop*, and *presbyter*, i.e. "elder," express two distinct sacred orders, has been a subject of much controversy. But it may be easily shown that there is no distinction of *order*, whatever distinction of *office* may exist.

(1.) The argument from the promiscuous use of these terms in the New Testament seems incontrovertible. Acts xx. 28 ; Titus i. 5 ; Phil. i. 1 ; 1 Peter v. 1 ; 2 John 1, etc.

(2.) A distinction between bishops and presbyters did indeed arise at a very early period ; but it proves nothing for a superior *order* nor for diocesan episcopacy : for it cannot be shown that the *power of ordination* was given to bishops to the exclusion of presbyters ; and this early distinction may be easily accounted for.

a.) It became expedient, doubtless, in the meetings of presbyters, at a very early period, that one should be chosen to preside over the rest ; but the practice, as testified subsequently by Jerome, was founded solely upon *expediency*. It is to be remembered, that the primitive churches were formed very much upon the model of the Jewish synagogues.

b.) As Christianity made its way, the concerns of the districts of country surrounding cities naturally fell under the cognizance of the bishops of those cities. Thus *diocesans* arose ;—subsequently, metropolitans, primates, patriarchs, and finally the pope came in. (Pp. 417-427.)

(3.) The doctrine of *succession* cannot be made out : and if it could, would only trace diocesan bishops to the bishops of parishes.

(4.) As for episcopacy itself, it may be freely allowed as a prudential regulation, wherever circumstances require it :—but it may be questioned whether presbyters could lawfully surrender their rights of government and ordination into the hands of a bishop, without that security which arises from the accountability of the administrator. (Pp. 427-432.)

3. On the subject of the *church* itself, very different views have been held :—

(1.) The Papist view contends for its visible unity throughout the world under a visible head.

(2.) The modern Independent view goes as far the other way. (Pp. 432-434.)

The persons appointed to feed and govern the church being, then, those who are called "*pastors*," we have now to notice,

III. *The share which the body of the people have in their own government.*

a. General views.

1. The connection of church and State gives rise to questions of peculiar perplexity and difficulty. But we do not consider the church in this connection.
 2. The New Testament view of the churches is, that they are associations founded upon conviction of the truth of Christianity, and the obligatory nature of the commands of Christ ;—and the mutual interdependence of pastors and people, with perfect religious liberty, is everywhere recognised in it.
 3. Questions of church government are often argued on the false ground, that the governing power, in churches to which communion is perfectly voluntary, is of the same character as when it is connected with the civil authority. Nothing can be more fallacious.
 4. In settling church government, there are pre-existing laws of Christ, which cannot be neglected or set aside. The government of the church is *in its pastors*, open to formal modifications ;—and it is to be conducted with *such a concurrence of the people* as shall guard against abuse, without interfering with the Scriptural exercise of pastoral duties. (Pp. 435–438.)
- b. These views applied to particular cases.
- (1.) As to the ordination of ministers. This power was never conveyed by the people : it was vested in the ministers alone, to be exercised on their responsibility to Christ.
 - (2.) As to the laws by which the church is to be

governed. Those which are explicitly contained in the New Testament are to be executed by the rulers, and obeyed by the people. (Pp. 439–443.)

(3.) Other disciplinary regulations are matters of mutual agreement; but democratic tendencies are to be shunned.

(4.) Power of admission and expulsion rests with the pastor, as also that of trying unworthy servants. (Pp. 443–447.)

IV. *The ends to which church authority is legitimately directed.*

1. The preservation and publication of sound doctrine: called by systematic writers, *potestas dogmatikē*: which may be thus summed up:—

(1.) To declare the sense in which the church interprets the language of Scripture.

(2.) To require all its members to examine such declarations of faith with docility and humility; while their right of private judgment is not violated.

(3.) To silence within its pale all preaching contrary to its standards. (Pp. 447–450.)

2. The power of regulation: called, technically, *potestas διατακτική*. (Pp. 450–452.)

3. The power of inflicting and removing censures; —*potestas διακριτική*.

(1.) Undoubtedly this power lies in the church: it has, however, been sadly abused. (Pp. 452–454.)

(2.) The claims of the Romish Church, in this

particular, are arrogant assumptions, *e.g.*, views founded on the gift of the keys to St. Peter. (Pp. 454-458.)

The labour of church government, and its difficulty, will always be greatly mitigated by a steady regard, on the part of both pastors and people, to *duties* as well as to *rights*. (Pp. 458-459.)

II. THE SACRAMENTS. (Ch. ii.-iv.)

(I.) NUMBER AND NATURE OF THE SACRAMENTS. (Ch. ii., Vol. iii.)

I. *Number* of the sacraments. Two only, baptism and the Lord's supper, are instituted in the New Testament, and admitted by Protestants. The Romish Church added five other sacraments.

1. The word used by the Greek Fathers was *μυστηριον* :—the Latin term is *sacramentum*, which signified (1,) a sacred ceremony, and (2,) the oath of fidelity taken by the Roman soldiers. For both these reasons, probably, the term was adopted by the Roman Christians.
2. The sacraments are to be viewed as federal acts, which view sweeps away the five superstitious additions of the Romish Church—confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction. (Pp. 460-463.)

II. *Nature* of the sacraments. There are three leading views.

1. That of the Church of Rome, *gratia ex opere operato*, that the sacraments contain the grace

they signify, and confer it, by the work itself.
The objections to this doctrine are,

- (1.) It has no pretence of authority from the Scriptures, nay,
 - (2.) It is decidedly antisciptural.
 - (3.) It debases the ordinance into a mere charm.
 - (4.) It tends to licentiousness.
 - (5.) It causes the virtue of the ordinance to depend upon the intention of the administrator. (Pp. 463-465.)
2. The opposite view is that of the Socinians, to which some orthodox Protestants have carelessly leaned,—that the sacraments are valuable solely as emblems of the spiritual and invisible. This scheme is as defective as that of the Papists is excessive. (Pp. 465-466.)
3. The third opinion is that of the Protestant churches:—expressed in the language (1,) of the Heidelberg Catechism, (2,) of the Church of England, (3,) of the Church of Scotland, containing the same leading views, that the sacraments are both *signs* and *seals*.
- (a.) Sense in which they are *signs*.
 - (b.) Sense in which they are *seals*. (Pp. 466-469.) See also *Dr. Halley* “On the Sacraments.”

(II.) SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM. (Ch. iii., Vol. iii.)

The *obligation* of baptism rests upon (1,) the example of our Lord; (2,) his command to the apostles, Matthew xxviii. 19; (3,) upon the practice of the apostles themselves.

I. *The nature of baptism.*

a. The Romanists consider baptism by a priest as of *itself* applying the merits of Christ to the person baptized:—and from this view arises their distinction between sins committed before and after baptism. The Lutheran Church places the efficacy of this sacrament in regeneration; nor has the Church of England departed entirely from the terms used by the Romish Church. The Quakers reject the rite altogether; and the Socinians merely regard it as a mode of professing the religion of Christ. (Pp. 470-472.)

b. The orthodox view is, that baptism is a federal transaction. It is of great importance to establish the *covenant* character of this ordinance.

(1.) The covenant with Abraham, Gen. xvii. 7-14, was the general covenant of grace, and not chiefly a political and national covenant:—there are *five* distinct stipulations, though they were promises of temporal advantages, under which are conveyed a higher and spiritual covenant of grace.

(2.) Circumcision was its “sign and seal,” both temporally and spiritually.

(3.) As a seal of restriction, circumcision was done away by Christ.

(4.) Paul’s different views of circumcision may be explained by considering the different principles on which circumcision might be

practised after it had become an obsolete ordinance: 1, 2, 3, 4. (Pp. 472-479.)

- (5.) Baptism is, to the *new* covenant, what circumcision was to the old, and took its place by the *appointment of God*. This may be argued, 1. From our Lord's commission to the apostles, Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15, 16. 2. From the words of our Lord to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born," etc. 3. From Col. ii. 10-12, "And ye are complete in him," etc. 4. From Gal. iii. 27-29, "For as many of you as have been baptized," etc. 5. From 1 Pet. iii. 20, "Which sometime were disobedient," etc.

a. Baptism is here called the *antitype* of Noah's salvation by the ark, because his building and entering it were the visible expression of his faith.

b. The meaning of the passage will vary with the rendering of the word *ἑπερώτημα*; but

c. However that word is rendered, the whole text shows, so our author thinks, that baptism, when an act of true faith, becomes an instrument of salvation. (Pp. 479-486.)

- (6.) Baptism, both as a *sign* and *seal*, presents an entire correspondence to the ancient rite of circumcision.

1. As a *sign*. Circumcision exhibited the *placability* of God,—held out the promise of justification,—and was the sign of sancti-

fication :—so baptism exhibits the divine placability,—is the initiatory rite into the covenant of pardon,—and is the symbol of regeneration. But baptism as a *sign* is more than circumcision, implying the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit in its *fulness*.

2. As a *seal*. As in circumcision, blessings were pledged *on the part of God*, so in baptism are all spiritual gifts pledged :—and as in circumcision a holy life was promised *on the part of the believer*, so in baptism do we pledge ourselves to the obedience of Christ.

Booth's objection, and the reply. See also *Dr. Halley* "On Baptism." (Pp. 487-491.)

II. *Subjects of baptism.*

- a. All *adults* who possess faith in Christ.
- b. *Infant children*. The practice of infant baptism may be shown to rest upon the strongest basis of Scriptural authority.
 - (1.) Infants were circumcised ; baptism takes the place of circumcision : therefore the absence of an explicit exclusion of infants is sufficient proof of their title to baptism.
 - (2.) The fact that the baptism of infants is nowhere prohibited in the New Testament, must have been misleading to all men, and especially to Jewish believers, if it were not proper.
 1. Baptisms were common among the Jews ; their proselyte baptism was a baptism of

families, and comprehended their infant children.

2. The words of Peter at the pentecost, "Repent and be baptized, for the promise is unto you and to your children," could not have been understood by the Jews except as calling upon them and their children to be baptized. Reasons, 1, 2, 3. (Pp. 492-499.)
- (3.) Infant children are declared by Christ to be members of his church.
 1. They were so under the old dispensation, and no change was made.
 2. We have our Lord's direct testimony to this point—in two remarkable passages : a) Luke ix. 47, 48; b) Mark x. 14, 16. Notice the Baptist evasions of the argument from this latter passage. (Pp. 499-504.)
- (4.) The argument from apostolic practice next offers itself.

As to the absence of any express mention of infant baptism, instead of bearing in favour of the Baptists, it is a strong argument against them; for such an extraordinary alteration as the forbidding of infant baptism would have required particular explanation. The baptisms of *whole houses* mentioned in the Acts are sufficient proof of the apostolic practice; they were either (1) *instances* of apostolic action, which would cover the whole ground, or (2) *peculiar cases*;—and even if this latter be ad-

mitted, the Baptist must still show, that neither in the family of

1. The Philippian jailer, nor in that of
2. Lydia, nor yet in that of
3. Stephanas, (1 Cor. i. 16,) were there *any* infants at all, which, to say the least of it, is very improbable. (Pp. 504-511.)
- (5.) The last argument may be drawn from the antiquity of the practice of infant baptism.
 1. We have strong presumptive proof of its antiquity in the fact, that if it were ever introduced as an innovation, it was introduced without controversy!
 2. Tertullian, (second century,) was the only ancient writer who opposed infant baptism; but his very opposition proves the practice older than himself; he never speaks of its *novelty*.
 3. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Origen mention infant baptism as the practice of their times; and in A.D. 254 the question of deferring baptism to the eighth day was discussed.
 4. The Anabaptists are of modern origin. (Pp. 511-514.)

III. *Benefits of baptism.*

1. To the adult believer it is, (1) the sign of his admission into the covenant of grace; (2) the seal, on the part of God, of the fulfilment of all its provisions; (3) the pledge, on his own part, of steadfast faith and obedience.

2. To the infant it conveys a pledge of divine grace,—the present blessing of Christ,—the gift of the Holy Spirit,—and the respect which God has to the believing act of the parents.
 3. To the parents it is a benefit also. It assures them that their God will be also “the God of their seed after them.” (Pp. 514-515.) See also the article “BAPTISM,” in Mr. Bastow’s Bible Dictionary.
- IV. *Mode of baptism.* . This is comparatively of little moment, but has been the subject of much controversy. In considering the doctrine that the only legitimate mode of baptizing is by immersion, we notice,
- a. *Several presumptions against it.*
 - (1.) It is not expressly enjoined.
 - (2.) It is unsuitable to many climates and circumstances—nay, sometimes impossible.
 - (3.) It puts away the consideration of health and life in many cases.
 - (4.) It is likely to distract the thoughts.
 - (5.) It is improbable that the three thousand converts of the day of Pentecost were immersed, or that the jailer’s family were.
 - (6.) The practice is not a decent one.
 - b. *The argument from antiquity.*
 - (1.) Immersion is ancient,—so is anointing with oil, etc.
 - (2.) Aspersions and effusions are also ancient,—witness Tertullian, Cyprian, Gennadius, Aquinas, Erasmus.

- (3.) The baptism of *naked* subjects was ancient, —doubtless a superstitious extension of the original rite. (Pp. 515-519.)

c. *The argument from the New Testament.*

- (1.) Use of the word βαπτίζω.

1. The verb, with its derivatives, signifies either to dip, stain, wet with dew, etc.
2. Employment of it in Scripture illustrated by various passages : 2 Kings iii. 11 ; Luke vii. 44 ; Dan. iv. 33 ; 1 Cor x. 2. It is used generally in the New Testament to express the act of pouring or sprinkling water. (Pp. 520-521.)

- (2.) Cases of baptism, in the New Testament, adduced commonly in proof of immersion.

1. John's baptism, "They were baptized of him *in* Jordan," therefore they were immersed, is the argument. But

(a.) The object of this passage was to declare the *place*, not the *mode* of John's baptism.

(b.) The "baptism with the Holy Ghost" sufficiently illustrates the mode of John's baptism, the same form of words being used in regard to both.

(c.) The character of the river and the scarcity of water accounts for the place of baptism, and for the language employed here to fix it. River baptism does not necessarily imply immersion. Quotation from Wolfe. (Pp. 522-525.)

2. Our Lord's baptism. "He went up straightway out of the water," Matt. iii. 16. This does not favour immersion more than any other mode of baptism.
 3. The eunuch's baptism. "And when they were come up out of the water," etc., Acts viii. 38. If this proves any immersion, it proves that Philip was immersed as well as the eunuch. But *εἰς* and *ἐκ* do not necessarily mean *into* and *out of*.
 4. Baptism by the disciples of Jesus and by John in Ænon, John iii. 22. No proof of immersion. (Pp. 526-529.)
- (3.) Argument from Romans vi. 3, 4, "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism," etc. Some suppose a comparison is instituted between the burial of Christ and immersion. But
1. If such resemblance be intended by "buried," why not also by "planted" and "crucified," both which terms are used in the same connection?
 2. The type of our death, burial, and resurrection as believers, in this passage, is not the clumsy one of immersion; but the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord.
- We conclude, therefore, that the pouring out of water was the apostolic mode of administering the ordinance, and that washing and immersion were introduced near the latter end of the second century, along with other

superstitious additions to this sacrament.
(Pp. 529-533.) See also *Prof. M. Stuart*
"On the Mode of Christian Baptism." 1833.

(III.) SACRAMENT OF LORD'S SUPPER.

(Ch. iv., Vol. iii.)

Agreement and difference between baptism and the Lord's supper, as stated in the Larger Catechism, used in the Church of Scotland. We notice now,

I. *The institution of the ordinance.*

1. As baptism took the place of circumcision, so the Lord's supper was instituted in place of of the passover.
2. It was instituted by Christ immediately after celebrating the passover for the last time with his disciples. (Pp. 534-535.)

II. *Its perpetuity and obligation.*

From 1 Cor. xi. 23, 26, we learn,

1. That Paul received a special revelation as to this ordinance.
2. That the command of Christ, "This do in remembrance of me," was laid by Paul upon the Corinthians.
3. That he regarded the Lord's supper as a rite to be *often* celebrated. (Pp. 535-536.)

III. *Its nature.*

1. Various views of

(1.) The Church of Rome, which held the doctrine of transubstantiation,—of an intrinsic value in the elements themselves,—

of the elements being proper objects of worship and homage,—and of the cup being withheld from the laity.

- (2.) Luther, who held that though the bread and wine remain unchanged, the body and blood of Christ are received together with them,—the doctrine of consubstantiation.
- (3.) Carolostadt and Zuingle, who taught that the bread and wine are the *signs* of the absent body and blood of Christ. This view is adopted, with some liberality, by the Socinians.
- (4.) The reformed churches, which reject both transubstantiation and consubstantiation, but go further than the Socinians, in declaring that to all who remember Christ worthily, he is spiritually present in the sacrament. (Pp. 536–543.) See also *Dr. Halley* “On the Lord’s Supper.”

2. Sacramental character of the ordinance.

- (1.) As to Christ. The words, “This is my body,” etc., show that the Lord’s supper is a visible sign that the covenant was ratified by the sacrificial death of Christ.
- (2.) As to the recipients. It is a recognition of their faith in the sacrificial death of Christ.
- (3.) As a sign, it exhibits, a) the love of God, b) the love of Christ, c) the extreme nature of his sufferings, d) the vicarious character of his death, e) the benefits derived from it through faith.
- (4.) As a seal, it is, a) a pledge of the con-

tinuance of God's covenant, b) a pledge to each believer of God's mercy, c) an exhibition of Christ as the spiritual food of the soul, d) a renewed assurance of divine grace. (Pp. 543-546.)

IV. *General observations.*

1. The ordinance excludes, not only open unbelievers, but all who deny the atonement.
2. All are disqualified who do not give evidence of genuine repentance and desire for salvation.
3. Every church should shut out such persons by discipline.
4. But the table of the Lord is not to be surrounded with superstitious terrors.
5. There is no rule as to the frequency of celebrating the ordinance.
6. Its habitual neglect by professing Christians is highly censurable. It therefore becomes the duty of every Minister to explain the obligation, and to show the advantages, of this sacrament, and earnestly to enforce its regular observance upon all those who give satisfactory evidence of "repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." (Pp. 546-548.)

THE END.

BOOKS

Sold at the Primitive Methodist Book-room.

A BIBLE DICTIONARY,

BEING A COMPREHENSIVE DIGEST OF THE
HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF THE HEBREWS
AND NEIGHBOURING NATIONS:

*The Natural History, Geography, and Literature of the Sacred
Writings,*

WITH REFERENCE TO THE LATEST RESEARCHES.

By THE REV. JAMES AUSTIN BASTOW.

Third Edition. Handsomely done up in Cloth, price 10s. 6d.

The *London Quarterly Review* says of this Bible Dictionary :
"It is a good book, well worthy to compete with the many pro-
ductions of the same kind that have during the last few years
been issued. A third edition shows the appreciation of the
public, and has given the industrious and conscientious author
an opportunity to bring up his Dictionary to the standard of
more recent investigation. We note with special satisfaction
that the work includes more of the directly theological element
than is usually attempted in Bible Dictionaries. An able Intro-
duction to the Literature of the Bible, occupying fifty-two close
pages, will be found exceedingly useful by a large number of
readers."

Bourne's, H., Commentary on the Gospel of	s.	d.
St. John. 12mo., 143 pp.		

Neat cloth	1	0
Gilt	1	4

Bourne's, H., Ecclesiastical History. From the
Creation to the Eighteenth Century of the Christian
Era. Revised, condensed, &c., with a Preface by
William Antliff, D.D. Crown 8vo., 527 pp.

Extra cloth	6	0
Half-bound	8	0
Morocco	10	0

History of the Primitive Methodist Connexion,
from its rise to the Conference of 1860, being the
Jubilee Volume of the Connexion. Compiled by the
Rev. John Petty, and approved by the Conference.

Library edition, 8vo., 616 pp., morocco	12	0
Medium edition, ditto, half calf	7	6
Cheap edition, ditto, cloth	5	0

HYMN BOOKS.

	12mo.	s.	d.
Calf, marbled edges	4	4
Calf, extra, marbled	4	10
Morocco, gilt edges	5	10
„ Antique	10	0

16mo., in Two Columns.

Embossed Roan, gilt edges	3	0
Morocco, ditto, limp	4	0
Morocco, ditto, boards	5	6
Morocco, extra, very neat	5	0
Morocco, extra, rim and clasp	6	0

18mo.

Roan, embossed gilt edges	2	8
Calf, marbled edges	2	10
Calf, extra, gilt edges	3	6
Morocco, extra, gilt edges	5	0
Morocco, ditto, rim and clasp	6	0

32mo.

School edition, strong cloth...	1	3
Red Sheep	1	10
Roan, embossed, gilt edges	2	4
Calf, marbled edges	2	6
Calf, ditto, one clasp	2	8
Calf, extra, marbled...	2	8
Calf, ditto, one clasp...	2	10
Morocco, extra, gilt edges	4	6
Morocco, gilt edges, rim and clasp	5	4

BIBLE AND TWO COLUMN HYMN BOOK.

Roan, gilt edges	4	6
Morocco, extra, gilt edges	7	0
Morocco, „ rim and clasp	9	0
Morocco, elegant, antique, gilt edges, &c.	8	6
BIBLE, to correspond with the best 18mo. Hymn Book	4	6

REVIVAL HYMN BOOK.

Roan, embossed, gilt edges	1	0
Morocco, gilt, very neat	2	0

SCHOOL HYMN BOOKS.

Paper cover, 115 hymns, 64 pp.	0	1
Cloth limp	0	2
Cloth, lettered, 348 hymns, 192 pp.	0	4
Roan, gilt ditto, ditto	0	6

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW



D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 09 13 06 13 024 0